THE NATIONAL ERA.

L. P. NOBLE, PUBLISHER. G. BAILEY, JUN., EDITOR AND PROPRIETOR; J. G. WHITTIER, CORRESPONDING EDITOR. BUELL & BLANCHARD, PRINTERS.

VOL. II. WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, JUNE 8, 1848. NO. 75.

The National Era is Published Weekly, on Seventh Street, opposite the Patent Office.

TERMS.

Two dollars per annum, *payable in advance.*

Advertisements not exceeding ten lines inserted three times for one dollar; every subsequent insertion, twenty-five cents.

BUSINESS NOTICES.

☞ All communications relating to the *business matters* of the paper, &c., and particularly the names of subscribers, remittances, &c., should be addressed to L. P. Noble, Publisher.

☞ As this paper is not sent to any new subscriber, unless paid for in advance, the reception of it will be a sufficient receipt.

☞ Agents and others, in sending names, are requested to be very particular, and have each letter distinct. Give the name of the *Post Office*, the *County*, and the *State*.

☞ Orders are coming in daily for papers without the pay. No paper will be sent except the pay accompany the order. *Funds may be sent at our risk, by mail, taking care to have the letter put in an envelope, and well sealed,* directed, post paid, to the Publisher.

☞ Any clergyman who will procure four subscribers, and send us eight dollars, may have a fifth copy gratis for one year.

☞ Accounts are kept with *each subscriber*, and when we receive money from him on his subscription, it is immediately passed to his credit.

☞ Agents will notice that we keep an account with each subscriber. Hence no accounts will be kept with the agents; and in transmitting moneys on which they are entitled to a commission, they will retain the amount of their commission, and, *in all cases*, forward the money with the names, so as to make the account even at each remittance.

☞ Agents and others who wish to send us fractional parts of a dollar, can now do so without increasing the postage, by remitting *pre-paid post office stamps*, which can now be obtained at any post office.

☞ Agents or others having funds to forward are desired, if the amount be considerable, to purchase of some bank a draft on New York, Philadelphia, or Baltimore. Smaller amounts may be transmitted by mail, observing, when convenient, to send large bills on New England, New York, Philadelphia, or Baltimore banks. Do not send certificates of deposite.

☞ Mr. V. B. Palmer, at his newspaper agency, New York, Philadelphia, Boston, and Baltimore, is duly authorized to procure advertisements for this paper.

☞ Within the last week we have received two or three requests to have the direction of papers changed, without informing us to what post office, county, or State, the papers have heretofore been sent. Without these, we cannot change the direction.

☞ We invite the attention of those who are remitting moneys to the publisher of this paper to the following table, showing the rate of discount on uncurrent money in this city. We earnestly hope that those who send money will endeavor to send such bank bills as are at the lowest discount:

Washington, D. C.	Par.	
Baltimore	Par.	
Philadelphia	Par.	
New York city	Par	
New York State	¾	per ct.
New England	½	do.
New Jersey	¾	do. dis.
Eastern Pennsylvania	¾	do.
Western Pennsylvania	1½	do.
Maryland	½	do.
Virginia	¾	do.
Western Virginia	1½	do.
Ohio	2¼	do.
Indiana	2¼	do.
Kentucky	2¼	do.
Tennessee	3½	do.
Michigan	3	do.
Canada	5	do.

THE NATIONAL ERA.

WASHINGTON, JUNE 5, 1848.

For the National Era.

STRAY LEAVES FROM MARGARET SMITH'S DIARY IN THE COLONY OF MASSACHUSETTS.

[CONTINUED.]

NEWBURY ON YE MERRIMACK, *July ye 14th*, 1678.

We were hardly well on our way yesterday, from Agawam, when a dashing young gallant rode up very fast behind us. He was fairly clad, in rich stuffs, and rode a nag of good mettle. He saluted us with much ease and courtliness, offering especial compliments to Rebecca, to whom he seemed well known, and who I thought was both glad and surprised at his coming. As I rode near, she said it gave her great joy to bring to each other's acquaintance, Sir Thomas Hale, a good friend of her father's, and her cousin Margaret, who, like himself, was a new comer. He replied, that he should look with favor on any one who was near to her in friendship or kindred; and, on learning my father's name, said he had seen him at his uncle's, Sir Matthew Hale's, many years ago, and could vouch for him as a worthy man. After some pleasant and merry discoursing with us, he and my brother fell into converse upon the state of affairs in the Colonie, the late lamentable warre with the Narraganset and Pequod Indians, together with the growth of heresie and schism in the Churches, which latter he attributed to the wicked policy of the Home Government, in checking the wholesome severity of the laws here enacted against the schemers and ranters. "I quite agree," said he, "with Mr. Rawson, that they should have hanged ten where they did one." Cousin Rebecca here said she was sure her father was now glad the laws were changed, and that he had often told her that, although the condemned deserved their punishment, he was not sure that it was the best way to put down the heresie. If she was ruler, she continued, in her merry way, she would send all the schemers and ranters, and all the sour, crabbed, busy-bodies in the churches, off to Rhode Island, where all kinds of folly, in spirituals as well as temporals, were permitted, and one crazy head could not reproach another.

Falling back a little, and waiting for Robert Pike and cousin Broughton to come up, I found them marvelling at the coming of the young gentleman, who it did seem had no special concernment in these parts, other than his acquaintance with Rebecca, and his desire of her companie. Robert Pike, as is natural, looks upon him with no great partialitie, yet he admits him to be well-bred, and of much and varied knowledge, acquired by far travel as well as study. I must say, I like not his confident and bold manner, and bearing, toward my fair cousin; and he hath more likeness of a cast-off danglor at the court, than of a modest and seemly country gentleman, of a staid and well-ordered house. Mistress Broughton says he was not at first accredited in Boston, but that her father, and Mr. Atkinson, and the chief people there now, did hold him to be not only what he professeth as respecteth his gentlemanly lineage, but also learned, and ingenious, and well versed in the Scriptures, and the works of godly writers, both of ancient and modern time. I noted that Robert was very silent during the rest of our journey, and seemed abashed and troubled in the presence of the gay gentleman; for, although a fair and comely youth, and of good family and estate, and accounted solid and judicious beyond his years, he does, nevertheless, much lack the ease and ready wit with which the latter commendeth himself to my sweet kinswoman.

We forded about noon a broad stream called Parker river, very deep, so that we wetted our hose and skirts somewhat; and soon, to our great joy, beheld the pleasant cleared fields and dwellings of the Settlement, stretching along for a goodlie distance, while, beyond all, the great ocean rolled, blue and cold, under an high easterly wind. Passing through a broad path, with well tilled fields on each hand, where men were busy planting corne, and young maidens dropping the seed, we came at length to uncle Rawson's plantation, looking well-nigh as fair and broad as the lands of Hilton Grange, with a good frame house, and large barne thereon. Turning up the lane, we were met by the house-keeper, a respectable kinswoman, who received us with great civilitie. Sir Thomas, although pressed to stay, excused himself for the time, promising to call on the morrow, and rode on to the Ordinary. I was sadly tired with my journey, and was glad to be shown to a chamber and a comfortable bed.

I was awakened this morning by the pleasant voice of my cousin, who shared my bed. She had arisen and thrown open the window looking towards the sun-rising, and the air came in soft and warm, and laden with the sweets of flowers and green growing things. When I had gotten myself ready, I sat with her at the window, and I think I may say it was with a feeling of praise and thanksgiving that mine eyes wandered up and down over the green meadows, and cornfields, and orchards, of my new home. Where, thought I, foolish one, be the terrors of the wilderness, which troubled thy daily thoughts and thy nightly dreams? Where be the gloomy shades, and desolate mountains, and the wild beasts, with their dismal howlings and rages! Here all looked peaceful, and bespoke comfort and contentedness. Even the great woods which climbed up the hills in the distance looked thin and soft, with their faint young leaves, a yellowish grey, intermingling with pale, silvery shades, indicating, as my cousin saith, the different kinds of trees, some of which, like the willow, do put on their leaves early, and others late, like the oak, with which the whole region aboundeth. A sweet, quiet picture it was, with a warm sun, very bright and clear, shining over it, and the great sea, glistening with the exceeding light, bounding the view of mine eyes, but bearing my thoughts, like swift ships, to the land of my birth, and so uniting, as it were, the newe world with the old. Oh, thought I, the merciful God, who reneweth the earth and maketh it glad and brave with greenery and flowers of various hues and smells, and causeth his south winds to blow and his rains to fall, that seed-time may not fail, doth even here, in the ends of his creation, prank and beautify the work of his hands, making the desert places to rejoice, and the wilderness to blossom as the rose. Verily his love is over all—the Indian heathen as well as the English Christian. And what abundant cause for thanks have I, that I have been safely landed on a shore so fair and pleasant, and enabled to open mine eyes in peace and love on so sweet a May morning! And I was minded of a verse which I learned from dear and honored mother when a child—

"Teach me, my God, thy love to know,
That this new light which now I see,
May both the work and workman show,
Then by the sun-beams I will climb to thee."

When we went below, we found on the window seat which looketh to the road-way a great bunch of flowers of manie kinds, such as I had never seen in mine own countrie, very fresh, and glistening with the dew. Now, when Rebecca took them up, her sister said, "Nay, they are not Sir Thomas's gift, for young Pike hath just left them." Whereat, as I thought, she looked vexed and ill at ease. "They are yours, then, cousin Margaret," said she, rallying, "for Robert and you did ride aside all the way from Agawam, and he scarce spake to me the day long. I see I have lost mine old lover, and my little cousin has found a new one. I shall write cousin Oliver all about it." "Nay," said I, "old lovers are better than new; but I fear my sweet cousin hath not so considered it." She blushed, and looked aside, and for some space of time I did miss her smile, and she spake little.

May ye 20th.—We had scarcely breakfasted, when him they call Sir Thomas called on us, and with him came also a Mr. Sewall, and the minister of the church, Mr. Richardson, both of whom did cordially welcome home my cousins, and were civil to my brother and myself. Mr. Richardson and Leonard fell to conversing about the state of the church; and Sir Thomas discoursed us in his lively way. After some little tarry, Mr. Sewall invited us to go with him to Deer's island, a small way up the river, where he and Robert Pike had some men splitting staves for the Bermuda market. As the day was clear and warm, we did readily agree to go, and forthwith set out for the river, passing through the woods for near a half mile. When we came to the Merrimac, we found it a great and broad stream. We took boats, and were rowed up the river, enjoying the pleasing view of the green banks, and the rocks hanging over the water, covered with bright mosses, and besprinkled with pale, white flowers. Mr. Sewall pointed out to us the different kinds of trees, and their natures and uses, and especially the sugar tree, which is very beautiful in its leaf and form, and from which the people of this countrie do draw a sap well nigh as sweet as the juice of the Indian cane, making good treacle and sugar. Deer's island hath rough, rocky shores, very high and steep, and is well covered with a great growth of trees, manie evergreen pines and hemlocks, which looked exceeding old. We found a good seat on the mossy trunk of one of these great trees, which had fallen from its extreme age, or from some violent blast of wind, from whence we could see the river running with loud noise over the rocks, and hear the melodious sound of the wind in the leaves of the pines, and the singing of birds ever and anon: and lest this should seem too sad and lonely, we could also hear the sounds of the axes and beetles of the workmen, clearing the timber, not far off. It was not long before Robert Pike came up, and joined us. He was in his working dress, and his face and hands were much discolored by the smut of the burnt logs, which Rebecca playfully remarking, he said there were no mirrors in the woods, and that must be his apology; that, besides, it did not become a plain man, like himself, who had to make his own fortune in the world, to try to imitate those who had only to open their mouths, to be fed like young robbins, without trouble or toil. Such might go as bravo as they would, if they would only excuse his necessitie. I thought he spoke with some bitterness, which indeed was not without the excuse, that the manner of our gay young gentleman towards him savored much of pride and contemptuousness. My beloved cousin, who hath a good heart, and who, I must think, apart from the wealth and family of Sir Thomas, rather inclineth to her old friend and neighbor, spake cheerily and kindly to him, and besought me privately to do somewhat to help her remove his vexation. So we did discourse of manie things, very pleasantly. Mr. Richardson, on hearing Rebecca say that the Indians did take the low melancholy noises of the pine trees in the winds to be the voices of the spirits of the woods, said that they always called to his mind the sounds in the mulberry trees which the prophet spoke of. Hereupon Rebecca, who hath her memory well provided with divers readings, both of the poets and other writers, did cite very opportunely some ingenious lines:

"Walk with thy fellow-creatures, note the hush
And whisperings among them: not a spring
Or leaf but hath his morning hymn, each bush
And oak doth know I AM."

And the same writer, she said, had something in one of his pieces, which might well be spoken of the aged and dead tree trunk, upon which we were sitting. And when we did all desire to know their import, she repeated them thus:

"And still a new succession sings and flies,
Fresh groves grow up, and their green branches shoot
Towards the old and still enduring skies,
While the low violet thrives at their root."

These lines, she said, were written by one Vaughn, a Brecknockshire Welsh doctor of medicine, who had printed a little book not many years ago. Mr. Richardson said the lines were good, but that he did hold the reading of ballads and the conceits of rhymes a waste of time, to say nothing worse. Sir Thomas hereat said that, as far as he could judge, the good people of New England had no great temptation to that sin from their own poets, and did then, in a drolling tone, repeat some verses of the cxxxvii psalm, which he said were the best he had seen in the Cambridge Psalm Book:

"The rivers on of Babilon,
There when we did sit doune,
Yea even then we mourned when
We remembered Sion.
Our harp we did hang it amid
Upon the willow tree;
Because there they that us away
Led to captivitie
Required of us a song, and thus
Askt mirth us waste who laid,
Sing us among a Sion's song
Unto us then they said."

"Nay, Sir Thomas," quoth Mr. Richardson, "it is not seemly to jest over the word of God. The writers of our Book of Psalms in Metre held rightly that God's altar needs no polishing; and truly they have rendered the words of David into English verse with great fidelitie."

Our young gentleman, not willing to displease a man so esteemed as Mr. Richardson, here made an apology for his jesting, and said that, as to the Cambridge version, it was indeed faithful; and that it was no blame to uninspired men, that they did fall short of the beautiee and richnese of the Lord's psalmist. It being now near noon, we crossed over the river, to where was a sweet spring of water, very clear and bright, running out upon the green bank. Now as we stood thirsty, having no cup to drink from, seeing some people near, we called to them, and presently there came running to us a young and modest woman, with a bright pewter tankard, which she filled and gave us. I thought her sweete and beautiful, as Rebecca of old, at her father's fountain. She was about leaving, when Mr. Richardson said to her, it was a foul shame for one like her to give heed to the ranting of the Quakers, and bade her be a good girl, and come to the meeting. "Nay," said she, "I have been there often, to small profit. The Spirit testifieth against thee and thy meeting." Sir Thomas jestingly asked her if the spirit she spoke of was not such an one as possessed Mary Magdalen.

"Or the swine of the Gadarenes?" asked Mr. Richardson.

I did smile with the others, but was presentlie sorry for it; for the young maid answered not a word to this, but, turning to Rebecca, she said, "Thy father hath been hard with us, but thou seemest kind and gentle, and I have heard of thy charities to the poor. The Lord keep thee, for thou walkest in slippery places; there is danger, and thou seest it not; thou trustest to the hearing of the ear and the seeing of the eye; the Lord alone seeth the deceitfulness and the guile of man; and if thou wilt cry mightily to Him, He can direct thee rightly."

Her voice and manner were very weighty and solemn. I felt an awe come upon me, and Rebecca's countenance was troubled. As the maiden left us, the minister, looking after her, said, "There is a deal of poison under the fair outside of yonder vessel, which I fear is fitted for destruction." "Margaret Brewster is indeed under a delusion," answered Robert Pike, "but I know no harm of her. She is kind to all, even to them who evil entreat her." "Robert! Robert!" cried the minister, "I fear me you will follow your honored father, who has made himself of ill repute, by favoring these people." "The Quaker hath bewitched him with her bright eyes, perhaps," quoth Sir Thomas. "I would she had laid a spell on an uncivil tongue I wot of," answered Robert, angrilie. Hereupon, Mr. Sewall proposed that we should return, and, in making ready and getting to the boat, the matter was dropped.

[TO BE CONTINUED.]

For the National Era.

SKETCHES OF MODERN REFORMS AND REFORMERS, IN GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND.

No. 9.—Law Reform—The Penal Code of England—Its Barbarity—The Death Penalty—Sir Samuel Romilly—His efforts to Abolish Capital Punishment—His Talents and Character.

The earliest mouth-piece of Jeremy Bentham in Parliament, and his "middleman" with the public, was Sir SAMUEL ROMILLY. This accomplished lawyer, from the period he entered Parliament, in 1806, till his death, in 1818, directed his main efforts to Law Reform; especially the amelioration of the Penal Code, and the diminution of the number of capital offences.

The present criminal code of England is a disgrace to civilization. When Romilly commenced his labors, it would have disgraced barbarism. Blackstone had said in his Commentaries, (and it was substantially true in 1806,) "Among the variety of actions which men are liable daily to commit, no less than one hundred and sixty are declared by act of Parliament to be felonies, without benefit of clergy; or, in other words, to be worthy of instant death." I will specify a few items in this bloody catalogue. Treason, murder, arson, and rape, were of course capital crimes. So was counterfeiting coin; refusing to take the oath of allegience under various circumstances; falsifying judicial records; taking a reward for restoring stolen goods, when accessory with the thief; obstructing the service of legal process; hunting in the night, disguised; writing threatening letters, to extort money; pulling down turnpike gates; assembling to produce riots, and not dispersing at the order of a magistrate; transporting wool or sheep twice out of the kingdom; smuggling; fraudulent bankruptcies; marrying a couple except in "a church," without the license of the Archbishop of Canterbury, and making false entries in relation thereto in a marriage register; wandering as gypsies thirty days; burglary, in the night; stealing, from the person, property above the value of twelve pence, or, from a dwelling house, above five shillings, or a vessel above forty shillings; stealing fish, hares, and conies; robbing on the highway to the value of a farthing; forgery in all its multiplied forms; sundry mere trespasses to personal property, such as tearing down fences, opening fish ponds, destroying trees in parks and gardens, maiming cattle—and the list might be swelled through a column.

So we see, that to steal a trout, from a gentleman's pond, subjected the offender to death; to pick his groom's pocket of twelve pence one farthing, death; to pluck a penny from his coachman on the highway, death; to enter his kitchen in the night, death; to pull down a rod of his fence, death; to cut down one of his apple trees, death; to chase his hares in the night, with a mask on, death; to break his buck's leg, death; to elbow a constable with a warrant in his hand, death; to refuse to swear allegiance to a king wading knee deep in the blood of his subjects, death; to refuse to run from an uproarious reform meeting, at the command of a town clerk, death; to send ten pounds of wool, twice, to France, death; to smuggle a keg of gin from Holland, death; to pass a bad penny, death; to sign John Doe's name to a shilling receipt, without his consent, death; to wilfully omit Richard Roe's name from the list of debtors under a bankrupt commission, death; to "go out a gypsying" a month, death; to worship Hymen in a dissenter's chapel, and record a false story about it, without leave of the Archbishop, death—"without benefit of clergy," with a vengeance! Alluding to some of these statutes, well might Sir Henry Spelman say, "while everything else since the Conquest has risen in value and grown dearer, the life of man has continually grown cheaper"—aye, leaving the law to fix the value, humanity in England was "dog-cheap."

The legal mode of inflicting punishment, in many of these cases, was equally barbarous with the penalties. Not content with killing the wretch, he might be dragged to the place of execution at the heels of horses; or emboweled while alive; or burnt to death; or beheaded, quartered, and the parts nailed up in conspicuous places; or his skeleton left to rot on the gallows; or his hands and ears cut off, and his nostrils slit; or be branded on the cheek or hand, before execution.

And, down to the reign of William III, counsel were not allowed to prisoners, even in cases of high treason, when the whole power of the Government was brought to crush them; and it was not till the recent reign of William IV, that, in other capital cases, counsel for the accused were allowed to do more than state points of law to the court.

Such a Penal Code would disgrace the Fejee Islands. Yet, it was the law of England in 1806; and, notwithstanding the lucubrations of Bentham, the dashing essays of Brougham, and the lucid speeches of Romilly and Mackintosh, sustained by the protests and the petitions of churchmen and dissenters, Catholics and Quakers, it remained the law, with slight modifications, till the reign of George IV; and much of it is law to this day!

And this code could be eulogized by the classical Blackstone; whilst Paley, the archdeacon, could congratulate the readers of his Moral Philosophy on the fact, that torture to extort confessions had been excluded "from the mild and cautious system of penal jurisprudence established in this country!" Such mildness *is* "a caution!" The same author, alluding to those who might happen to be convicted and hung through mistake, counsels their surviving friends not to repine, but "rather to reflect that he who falls by a mistaken sentence, may be considered as falling for his country."

No one will suppose that such laws, the offspring of the black ages, could be enforced against all offenders after the sunrise of the nineteenth century. Still, capital convictions under them were frightfully numerous. From 1802 to 1809, there were sent to a single prison in London 1,013 persons, charged with one species of capital offence, and 859 charged with another. During the same period, 508 persons were convicted in London of all species of capital offences. There is no reason to suppose, from the examination of imperfect statistics, that the number was greater in proportion, during that period, than in any other for half a century before. Probably the numbers given do not include one-third of those who were tried, nor one-twentieth of those who had committed capital crimes. Only a small proportion of those convicted suffered the punishment of death.

The statistics of English criminal jurisprudence afford abundant illustrations of the doctrines, that the severity of the law does not diminish crime, and that the certainty rather than the severity of punishment is the surest preventive. These doctrines had been maintained with great power by Lord Bacon, by Stiernhook, the Swedish Blackstone, by Blackstone himself, by the Marquis of Beccaria, by Voltaire, by Montesquieu, by Bentham; and even Paley had admitted their truth. Romilly enforced them in Parliament; and it may be safely affirmed, that the history of crime proves nothing if it does not establish their truth. Larcenies, burglaries, robberies, and forgeries, had increased in England during the eighteenth century, much beyond the advance of population and commerce, notwithstanding the severity of the law and its frequent execution. But these obvious facts were assigned to other causes than defects in the penal code, and these doctrines were scouted as the dogmas of visionary enthusiasts, by nearly the whole of the bench, the bar, and the leading influences in Church and State, at the dawn of the present century. They admitted that the unvarying execution of the law would be barbarous; but insisted that its frightful penalties ought to be suspended over the heads of offenders, to deter from crime; whilst they trusted to indirect modes of softening its rigors. So, judges undertook to bend the law to suit the merits of particular cases; and the humanity of juries, outrunning the injunctions of their oaths, opened the door of escape in cases of peculiar severity. The latter would frequently find that the value of the property stolen did not reach the capital point; as, that a shilling piece was worth but eleven pence farthing; or a crown, but four shillings and six pence; or goods for which the thief had asked £8, and refused £6, were worth but thirty-nine shillings! thus stultifying their senses to save a life which the law clamored to sacrifice. Then, in cases of conviction, where there were extenuating circumstances, a humane judge would often arrest the judgment on the flimsiest quibbles, or suspend the sentence, or respite the criminal, or suggest some grave doubt, founded on nothing, for the consideration of the full bench—anything to evade the penalties of an atrocious law. The wretch on trial did not know, even should he be convicted, whether he would be executed. If his offence was trivial, and he had friends, money, or a tolerable character, he might save his neck. But, if he had none of these, or the judge happened to be a flinty old fragment of the feudal system, he was pretty sure to be hung; not for stealing the sheep, but for being an orphan, a pauper, or a scamp in general. This uncertainty as to whether the law would be executed was often the lure which led to its violation; and these gross incongruities in its administration, constituting one of the chief temptations to its infringement, and clothing its fitful execution with double horrors, were strongly urged by Sir Samuel Romilly as reasons for the repeal.

Another evil resulting from the severity of the English code, was felt not only in that country, but has reached us and our times, and will afflict us so long as we are governed by the common law. Merciful judges, during the trial of offenders for minor crimes punishable with death, would lend a greedy ear to the ingenious cavils and absurd quirks of counsel, and quash the indictment—or refine away the plain words of a statute, so as to exclude the offence from its operation—anything to save the life of a fellow creature whose crime deserved a ten days' commitment to the House of Correction. And *we* are now reaping the fruits of this; for, be it known to the uninitiated, that all these cavils, refinings, quibbles, quirks, and quiddities, are recorded in books, and have come down to us as authoritative parts of "the perfection of human reason," making convenient holes for sturdy rogues, with the help of sharp-pointed lawyers, to creep through the meshes of our comparatively mild criminal code.

[THIS NUMBER TO BE CONCLUDED IN OUR NEXT.]

SELLING DRY GOODS.

People generally think that it is a very easy matter to stand behind a counter and retail dry goods; but a week's experience in the business would convince the cleverest man, that it is much more difficult and laborious than the task of turning a grindstone twelve hours per day.

The office of salesmen embodies, in its duties, the necessity for the shrewdness of a politician, the persuasion of a lover, the politeness of a Chesterfield, the patience of a Job, and the impudence of a pickpocket. There are salesmen who make it a point never to lose a customer. One of these gentlemen, who is in a store in Chatham street, not long since, was called to show a very fastidious and very fashionable lady—who "dropped in while going to Stewart's"—some rich silk cloaking. Every article of the kind was exposed to her view—the whole store was ransacked—nothing suited. The costly materials were stigmatized as "trash"—everything was "common," and not fit for a lady. She "guessed she would go to Stewart's." The salesman pretended to be indignant.

"Madam," said he, in a tone of injured innocence, "I have a very beautiful and rare piece of goods—a case which I divided with Mr. Stewart, who is my brother-in-law, but it would be useless to show it to you. It is the only piece in the city."

"Oh! allow me to see it," she asked, in an anxious tone; "and," she continued, "I have no intention of annoying you, or of disparaging the merits of your goods."

The salesman, who was now watched in breathless silence by his fellow clerks, proceeded, as if with much reluctance, and with expressions of fear that it would be injured by getting tumbled, to display an ancient piece of vesting, which had been lying in the store five years, and was considered to be unsaleable. The lady examined and liked it much. That was a piece of goods worthy to be worn. How much was it a yard?

"Twenty-two shillings."

"Oh! that is very high."

"There!" exclaimed he, beginning to fold it up, "I knew you would say that."

"Stay! stay! don't be in so great a hurry!" she cried, "I'll give you twenty shillings."

"Madam, you insult me again."

"Cut me off ——— yards, and you can make up the deduction on some velvet which I require for trimmings," almost entreated the fair shopper.

The salesman, after much persuasion, sold the lady the vesting, for which they had in vain sought to get five shillings per yard, at the price above indicated. The profits of the sale, on vesting and velvet, amounted to *thirty-three dollars*, out of which the clerks were permitted to pay for a supper of oysters. The best of this brief tale of dry goods is to be told. The lady had her cloak made, and one or two of her friends, delighted with it, bought the rest of the vesting at the same price.

There is a moral in this anecdote, which we leave to be discovered by the ingenuity of all our lady readers, who occasionally go shopping.

New York Paper.

HOSEA BIGELOW is the author of the following, which we find in the Anti-Slavery Standard. Hosea calls his production

THE PIOUS EDITOR'S CREED.

I do believe in Freedom's cause—
As fur away as Paris is;
I love to see her stick her claws
In them infernal Pharrysees;
It's well enough agin a King
To dror resolves and triggers—
But libbaty's a kind o' thing
That don't agree with niggers.

I do believe the People want
A tax on teas and coffees,
That nothin aint extravygunt,
Purvided I'm in office;
For I have loved my country sence
My eye-teeth fill'd their sockets;
And Uncle Sam I reverence,
Particklerly his pockets.

I do believe in *any* plan
Of levyin the taxes,
As long as, like a lumberman,
I git jest what I axes;
I go free trade through thick an' thin,
Because it kind o' rouses
The folks to vote—and keeps us in
Our quiet custom-houses.

I do believe it's wise and good
To send out furrin missions—
That is, on certain understood
And orthydox condishuns:
I mean nine thousand doll's per ann.,
Nine thousand more for outfit,
And me to reckomend a man
The place would jest about fit.

I do believe in speshul ways
Of prayin' and convartin';
The bread comes back in many days,
And buttered, too, for sartin';
I mean in preyin' till one busts
On what the party chooses,
And in convartin' public trusts
To very pryvit uses.

I do believe hard coin the stuff
For 'lectioneers to spout on;
The People's ollers soft enough
To make hard money out on;
Dear Uncle Sam pervides for his,
And gives a good-sized junk to all—
I don't care *how* hard money is,
As long as mine's paid punctooal.

I do believe with all my soul
In the gret Press's freedom,
To pint the People to the goal,
And in the traces lead 'em;
Palsied the arm that forges yokes
At my fat contracts squintin',
And withered be the nose that pokes
Inter the Guv'ment printin'!

I do believe that I should give
Whatever's his to Cæsar—
For it's by him I move and live,
From him my bread and cheese are;
I do believe that all of me
Doth bear his superscripshun—
Will, conshunce, honor, honesty,
And things of that descripshun.

I do believe in prayer and praise
To him that has the grantin'
Of jobs—in everything that pays—
But most of all in CANTIN';
This doth my cup with mercies fill,
This lays all thought of sin to rest—
I *don't* believe in principle,
But, oh! I *do* in interest.

I do believe whatever trash
Will keep the People in blindness—
That we the Mexicans can thrash
Right inter brotherly kindness;
I do believe that powder 'n ball
Are good-will's strongest magnets—
That peace, to make it stick at all,
Must be druv in with bagnets.

In short, I firmly do believe
In Humbug generally,
For it's a thing that I perceive
To have a solid vally;
This hath my faithful shepherd been,
In pastures sweet hath led me—
And this will keep the People green,
To feed as they have fed me.

H. B.

WORKING A TRAVERSE.

The following is the singular history of Mr. Labouchere, at present a member of the British Cabinet:

In 1822 he was a clerk in the banking house of Mr. Hope, at Amsterdam, and was sent by his patron to Lord Baring, the celebrated banker of London, to negotiate a loan. He displayed in this affair so much ability, that he attracted the attention of the English banker.

"Ah," said he one day to Lord Baring, "you have a charming daughter; will you not accord me her hand?"

"Young man, no pleasantry! I like you much, but how could Miss Baring become the wife of a common clerk?"

"But," said Labouchere, "if I were associated with Mr. Hope?"

"Ah, that is very different, and would materially lessen the inequality between you."

Mr. L. returned to Amsterdam, and said to his patron, "I must be your partner."

"My friend, do you think of that? You are without fortune, and"——

"But if I were a member of Lord Baring's family?"

"Indeed! why, in that case I would give you a partnership on the spot."

On the strength of these two promises, Mr. L. returned to England, and two months afterwards married Miss Baring, because he had the promise of Mr. Hope to make him partner as soon as he was married to her, and became associated with Mr. Hope because he was married to Miss Baring.

A GENTLE REPROOF.

One day, as Zachariah Hodgson was going to his daily avocations after breakfast, he purchased a fine large codfish, and sent it home, with directions to his wife to have it cooked for dinner. As no particular mode of cooking was described, the good woman well knew that, whether she boiled it or made it into a chowder, her husband would scold her when he came home. But she resolved to please him once, if possible, and therefore cooked portions of it in different ways. She also, with some little difficulty, procured an amphibious animal from a brook back of the house, and plumped into the pot. In due time, her husband came home. Some covered dishes were placed on the table, and with a frowning, fault-finding look, the moody man commenced the conversation.

"Well, wife, did you get the fish I bought?"

"Yes, my dear."

"I should like to know how you have cooked it. I will bet anything that you have spoiled it for my eating. [Takes off the cover.] I thought so. What in creation possessed you to fry it? I would as lief eat a boiled frog."

"Why, my dear, I thought you loved it best fried."

"You didn't think any such thing. You knew better; I never loved fried fish. Why didn't you boil it?"

"Dear, the last time we had fresh fish, you know I boiled it, and you said you liked it best fried. But I have boiled some."

So saying, she lifted a cover, and, lo! the shoulders of the cod, nicely boiled, were neatly deposited in a dish, a sight of which would have made an epicure rejoice, but which only added to the ill-nature of her husband.

"A pretty dish this!" exclaimed he. "Boiled fish? Chips and porridge! If you had not been one of the most stupid of womankind, you would have made it into a chowder!"

His patient wife, with a smile, immediately placed a tureen before him, containing an excellent chowder.

"My dear," said she, "I was resolved to please you. There is your favorite dish."

"Favorite dish, indeed," grumbled the discomfited husband; "I dare say it is an unpalatable, wishy-washy mess. I would rather have a boiled frog than the whole of it."

This was a common expression of his, and had been anticipated by his wife, who, as soon as the preference was expressed, uncovered a large dish near her husband, and there was a large BULL-FROG, of portentous dimensions and pugnacious aspect, stretched out at full length! Zachariah sprung from his chair, not a little frightened at the unexpected apparition.

"My dear," said his wife, in a kind, entreating tone, "I hope you will at length be able to make a dinner."

Zachariah could not stand this. His surly mood was finally overcome, and he burst into a hearty laugh. He acknowledged that his wife was right, and that he was wrong, and declared that she would never again have occasion to read him such another lesson; and he was as good as his word.

MR. CLAY AND THE GOAT.

Almost everybody in Washington City remembers an old he-goat which formerly inhabited Naylor's livery stable, on Pennsylvania avenue. This animal was, in all probability, the most independent citizen of the metropolis. He belonged to no party, though he frequently gave passengers *striking* proofs of adhesion to the *levelling* principle; for whenever a person stopped anywhere in his vicinage, Billy was sure to make at him, horns and all. The boys took delight in irritating this long-bearded gentleman, and frequently so annoyed him that he would make war against lamp-posts and trees, to their great amusement.

One day, the luminary of the West, Henry Clay, was passing along the avenue, and, seeing the boys intent on worrying Billy into a fever, stopped, and with his characteristic humanity expostulated with them on their cruelty. The boys listened in silent awe to the eloquent appeal of the great statesman, but it was all Cherokee to Billy, who (ungrateful scamp!) arose majestically on his hinder legs, and made a desperate plunge at his friend and advocate. Mr. Clay, although he had not "slain a Mexican," proved himself too much for his honorable assailant. He seized hold of both horns of the dilemma, and then was "the tug of war;" for Greek had met Greek. The struggle was long and doubtful.

"Ha!" exclaimed the statesman, "I have got you fast, you rascal! I'll teach you better manners! But, boys," continued he, turning to the laughing urchins, "what shall I do now?"

"Why, trip up his feet, Mr. Clay," said they. Mr. Clay did as he was told, and, after many severe efforts, brought Billy down on his side. Here he looked at the boys imploringly, seeming to say, "I never was in such a fix before."

The combatants were nearly exhausted; goaty had the advantage, for he was gaining breath all the while that the statesman was losing it.

"Boys," exclaimed he, puffing and blowing, "this is rather an awkward business. What am I to do now?"

"Why, don't you know?" said a little fellow, making preparations to run as he spoke. "All you've got to do is to let go, and run like blazes!"

From the Louisville Journal.

SONG.

BY F. COSBY.

All around and all above thee,
In the hush'd and charmed air,
All things woo thee, all things love thee,
Maiden fair!
Gentlest zephyrs, perfume breathing,
Waft to thee their tribute sweet,
And for thee the Spring is weaving
Garlands meet.
In their cavern'd, cool recesses,
Songs for thee the fountains frame;
Whatsoe'er the wave caresses
Lisps thy name.

Greener verdure, brighter blossom,
Wheresoe'er thy footsteps stray,
O'er the earth's enamored bosom
Live alway.
Wheresoe'er thy presence lingers,
Wheresoe'er its brightness beams,
Fancy weaves, with cunning fingers,
Sweetest dreams.
And the heart forgets thee never,
Thy young beauty's one delight,
There it dwells, and dwells forever,
Ever bright.

Mr. Ira Aldridge, the African tragedian, made his first appearance at the Surrey Theatre on Monday evening, 20th ult., as *Zanga*, in the "Revenge." Our Illustration represents the last scene of the tragedy, wherein he is trampling on the prostrate *Don Alonzo*. His reception throughout the performance was flattering; and, as the play progressed, the applause became enthusiastic. Mr. Aldridge possesses an excellent voice, commanding figure, and expressive countenance, to which he adds the advantages of education and study. His dress, which is novel and picturesque, reminds one of the portraits of Abd-el-Kader. Throughout the play he more than realized the high encomiums that had previously been passed upon him and many who ridiculed the idea of a native-born African successfully representing a dramatic character, retired with very different feelings. Nor is his talent confined to tragedy. His representation of *Mungo*, in "The Padlock," is a laughable performance, differing entirely from the Ethiopian absurdities we have been taught to look upon as correct portraitures; his total *abandon* is very amusing. He reappeared on the 27th, as *Othello*, with great success.

AN ECCENTRIC MINISTER.—There lived, a century since, in the city of Boston, an eccentric pastor, known familiarly as "Johnny Morehead." A convention of ministers was held in Boston, and met in his place of worship, to whom President Edwards, then settled at Northampton, was appointed to preach the opening sermon. In consequence of the bad roads, he did not arrive in time for the commencement of the service, and, after waiting, another minister was procured to preach. The service commenced; and while Mr. Morehead was offering up the first prayer, Mr. Edwards came in, with his saddle-bags on his arm, and walked up quietly to the head of the aisle, where he stood while the prayer was being made. Johnny went on praying for the blessings of God on his eminent servant, whose absence they had so much reason to regret; thanking him for his great and distinguished mercies conferred on his church by his pious and useful labors, and supplicating the blessings of God for him, that he might long be continued a great and shining light to the church of God in this waste-howling wilderness in which in his providence his people were planted; and, opening his eyes, he discovered Mr. Edwards standing below. He went on: "But, O Lord! thou knowest that, great and good as thy servant is, he is not to be compared to his wife!"

New York Knickerbocker.

REVOLUTIONARY INCIDENT.—Here is an anecdote of the Berlin revolution: "On the evening of the 18th ultimo, a body of the citizens who were engaged in constructing a barricade broke into a house in the Oranienburghstrasse. They penetrated to the first floor, and, forcing open a glass door, found themselves in the presence of a venerable old man, with long white hair. One of the mob inquired who he was. The old man answered, 'My name is Humboldt.' 'How? are you the celebrated Humboldt?' The old man replied, 'I am Alexander Von Humboldt.' Instantly every hat and cap was doffed; the mob made many protestations of regret at having inconvenienced their illustrious countryman, and placed at the door of the house an honorary guard of the citizens."

For the National Era.

THE POSITION OF THE CHURCH ON THE SUBJECT OF SLAVERY.

To John C. Vaughan, Esq., Editor of the Louisville "Examiner:"

I have just read, in the *Examiner* of the 4th instant, an editorial article, headed "What think you, Christians?" and this has led me to reperuse another, in the paper of the 29th January, headed "The Church." I admire the mildness and firmness which characterize these, as well as all the other articles of your paper. You and Dr. Bailey have found out what, I regret, some other friends of reform have not—that nothing is to be gained in urging forward a holy cause by a resort to the carnal weapons of indiscriminate invective. In so saying, I do not mean that the *rose-water system* of treatment is to be used with that contemptible, yet numerous, class in the North, denominated by John Randolph "dough-faces;" nor with those men who have emigrated from the North to the South, and married plantations of land and gangs of slaves, with *wives annexed to them.* If there be men on earth who need daggers spoken to their hearts in the use of reproof, these are the men. They are masses of selfishness. They have no *real* sympathy for the South, but, to secure for themselves present popularity or worldly gain, are willing that their Southern brethren should be cursed forever with the leprosy of the slave system. From my observation, the most cruel and inveterate slaveholders are those Northern ecclesiastics, who have gone South to better their condition; and I would venture the opinion, that the professed Minister of the Gospel who wrote the bill of sale for the trader on the Cumberland river, to which you allude, was a *Northern* man. These Esaus, when they sell their principles for a mess of pottage, are prepared to go all lengths in servility; and when I look at the number of preachers in the various denominations who have done this thing, there is no doubt in my mind, that the greatest hinderance to Emancipation in the South is to be found in *their* fierce opposition.

To me, the position of the church in this country, and especially in Kentucky, in regard to the cause of Emancipation, has long been a matter of the deepest sorrow. I have read again and again the noble Address of the Synod of Kentucky, on the subject of slavery, from which you make an extract, and wondered whether the men who drew up, adopted, and published that remarkable document, are still in the land of the living. Upon inquiry, I find they are; and how to account for the apparent extinction of their spirit, is beyond my ability. Have they recanted the Anti-Slavery principles of the Address? If not, are not the reasons for promulgating and defending those sentiments in Kentucky more numerous and weighty now than they were ten years ago? Is the present silence of these gentlemen only the stillness that precedes the storm of healthful agitation; or is it the silence of *death?*

The cause of Emancipation, my dear sir, will never move on as it *ought*, until *the Church*, in its various denominations, arouses from her slumbers and co-operates in the work. The Church, by the appointment of her great Head, is the Light of the world and the Salt of the earth. She is Heaven's appointed instrumentality for carrying on all reformatory movements in this sin-cursed world. It is her mission, "to root out and to pull down, and to destroy and to throw down," everything that is wrong; and "to build up and to plant" every good thing. She is the depository of the truth, holding it as a trustee, for the benefit of a ruined race; and her ministry are the appointed expounders of that truth. As there is no disease, of the thousands that flesh is heir to, for which a remedy may not be found in the great pharmacopœia of nature, if timely application be made; so, also, for all the moral, social, and political evils, that afflict the world, there is a remedy in the Christian religion. It were a gross misconception of the character of God, to suppose that He has left the human race to struggle on in the dark, without any hope of the great end of the social state being attained. No. In the religion of Jesus Christ we have, not merely the *good will* and the *attempt* to restore man to his proper place, but a *perfect remedy* for every evil that Sin brought into this world. Like every other remedy, however, its efficacy depends upon its *application to the disease.* If the Church, which is the legitimate Trustee of Christianity, will, through her *ministry* and *people*, grapple with the evils which make this world a lazar house, they will be removed, and the race will be happy. If, however, she pursues the course of neither doing these things herself, nor allowing others to do them, then there is no hope. "Churchianity" may thrive, but Christianity will perish. In what I have said of the ministers of religion, there was no design to flatter that class of men with improper ideas of their own importance. Honor is always commensurate with responsibility; and if the ministry is an institution of God's appointment, for the regeneration and salvation of the human family, we have a right to expect that they will do their duty, or bear the responsibility of the continuance of evil. It depends upon this class of men whether the reforms of the present day shall succeed or not. The Press and the Politicians may do their utmost to arouse the public conscience to a proper state of feeling on the subject of Slavery, but if the Ministers of the Gospel, in the pulpit, on the Sabbath, apply narcotics to the conscience, by learned apologetic disputations on "doulas" and "despots," all will be in vain. I solemnly believe, that the responsibility of the existence of slavery in the United States, with all its innumerable evils, rests upon the *Church.* She might have abolished it long ago, had she been apostolical in her zeal and faithfulness. But she yielded to every demand made by Slavery, so that now she herself is enslaved. I know, that when such facts as these are stated, it is common in some quarters to cry out, "Infidelity!" "infidelity!" It was so, when Luther sounded the tocsin, and alarmed the guilty consciences of the Priesthood of Germany. It was so, when Knox, a slave in the galleys of the Loire, flung the image of the "mother of God" into the river, calling it a "*pented bredd.*" But, my dear sir, we must not be frightened away from our great work by such senseless jargon as this. We have a right to demand that the Church *should* be what she *ought* to be, and MIGHT be, and MUST be, if the dial of the world's progress is not to go back ten degrees.

It is a fact, which thousands of good people are ignorant of, that the churches in this country receive to the communion table great numbers of members who live in the known and habitual practice of concubinage and adultery! These are the slaves, who are forced to violate the Divine institution of marriage. The Methodist Church South has no less than 124,000 such adulterers in her communion; and how many the Baptists and Presbyterians of the United States have, is unknown. I shall not stop to inquire, whether it is not a greater sin and disgrace to allow those to come to the communion table, who keep and compel the slaves to live in adultery. But here is a fact, known to all men conversant with the subject, that hundreds of thousands of professing Christians in the United States are living in the practice of adultery and concubinage. Judge Graham, in his letter of the 8th of February, says: "It is believed that chastity is a virtue almost unknown to slaves." Now, suppose a male and female slave, members of the church, overhearing something didactic on the subject of chastity, and the obligations of marriage, should come to their master, who is a Presbyterian minister, for instance, and ask him to solemnize marriage between them, as an ordinance of God. They say that, as Christians, they feel bound to obey the Divine law, "that, to avoid fornication, let every man have his own wife, and every woman her own husband." Could the minister refuse to honor this institution of Heaven's appointment, when applied to by professing Christians? But how would he proceed? Would he bind this couple together "till separated by death," as the ordinance requires? Would he say, after the contract is entered into by the parties, "Whom God hath joined together, let *not man* put asunder?" If he would not, then it would be no marriage. If he would, then it were sheer mockery and prostitution of a Divine institution; for the law does not recognise slaves as *persons*, capable of sustaining the marriage relation, but *things.* Now, what shall be done? Which shall yield? Christianity, with its demand, that God's own institution of marriage shall be respected by at least the teachers and professors of Christianity—or Slavery, with its demand, that immortal beings, redeemed by the blood of Christ, and made heirs of glory, shall be robbed of the Christian right of marriage, and be forced to live in adultery? To which of these two claims, the one from Heaven, the other from Hell, does he yield? Remembering his high character as a shepherd of the sheep, does he stand upon the foundations of Truth, and defend the souls that have been solemnly committed to his pastoral care? Remembering the solemn vow which he took at his ordination, "to be zealous and faithful in maintaining the truths of the Gospel, and the *purity* and peace of the Church, *whatever persecution* or *opposition* may arise unto you on that account," does he hurl defiance at the foul system, that would dare to come into the sacred enclosure of his fold, and *chattelize* those for whom Christ died, and who will shine as stars in the firmament of glory forever? Alas! alas! that very Minister of a Gospel whose chief glory is that it is preached to the poor—after all his solemn vows to the contrary—agrees to it that God's own institution of marriage shall be trampled in the dust, and that professing Christians, in a state of preparation for the holiness of heaven, may live in concubinage and adultery! There are some things in the institution of Slavery that I could tolerate—its oppression, for instance—for the Israelites in Egypt were sorely *oppressed.* The Irish are *oppressed*, and the *seamstresses* of our large cities are oppressed. But its hellish impudence, in entering the sacred precincts of home, trampling down the marriage relation, and sundering the endearing ties of parent and child, which so sweeten our sorrows in this vale of tears, I cannot tolerate. You have a right, then, my dear sir, to ask, as you do, that the Ministers of Christ shall come forward and defend the sanctity of an institution of Christ, upon which depends the purity of families and the Church, and the welfare, too, of the State. Does any one apologize for the Church and Ministry, by saying that Slavery is a *legal*, *political* affair, with which the Church cannot meddle? But of whom is the Church composed? Are her ministers and professors *missionaries* in a Mohammedan or Pagan country, under civil disfranchisement? No. They are *individuals, citizens* of the *United States*, with the right of *suffrage*, in a Government where the *People* rule. If they grieve over this state of things, let them, as citizens and voters, act out their re-

ligion, and *alter* the law. Let the Ministers of the Gospel, like the Apostles, in the dread name of their God, go before the people with the commands of God, and the claims of Man in regard to the rite of *marriage*—let them explain its origin, its nature, its duties—and in one year, the People, in their legislative capacity, will place the institution where God placed it, and the Church would not be under the disgraceful necessity of admitting fornicators and adulterers to her communion.

Have you, then, my dear sir, no men in Kentucky who have a mind to this work of reform? Are all the Breckinridges dead? Has "Old Father Rice" no lineal descendants among the men of this generation? Where is John C. Young, who has the enviable reputation of having drafted the Address of the Synod of Kentucky? Must your noble and heroic Fee stand alone in the strife, and say, as Wellington did on the field of Waterloo, "Would to God night or Blucher would come?"

I admire your tenderness in dealing with the clergy. It is interesting and even amusing to see how uncommonly careful you are in your movements, lest you should tread rather roughly upon their extremities. But, at the same time, I would suggest, that you occasionally sound a peal of thunder in their ears. You have their *consciences* on your side, and they wont dare to get angry. You can show them a work which, by their ordination vows, they are sworn to perform—to *defend*, and *keep sacred, God's own institution of marriage*; that it is not, like all other interests, trodden down under the iron hoofs of Slavery. Oh! what a glorious sight it would be, for the redeemed in heaven, and the good on earth, to see the Ministers of the Gospel going forth among the people with this alternative—Christianity must put down Slavery, or Slavery must put down Christianity! Who can doubt the issue of the contest? The truth would triumph! Man would be free! But, alas! we, in this age, have not faith in God, and Truth, and Man. We are what Carlyle would call "*simulacra*"—semblances of warriors, not realities. Were we the living embodiment of the teachings of our blessed Saviour, so grievous a wrong as Slavery could not exist in the land. But yet I do not despair, and would encourage you to go on, and arouse the Church. Instead of her *opposition*, could you have her *co-operation*, how soon the chain links would snap, and the dark cloud that hovers over our political horizon be dispelled.

Shall I apologize for this extemporaneous letter? I will not. The vastness of the interests involved in the cause to which you have devoted your energies, makes every word of encouragement valuable. May the God of the oppressed sustain you, and endow you with the peculiar qualifications necessary for one occupying your station; and may you live to unite your voice in the glad song of Universal Emancipation!

THEOPHILUS.

March 10, 1848.

THE NATIONAL ERA.

WASHINGTON, JUNE 8, 1848.

THE TREATY RATIFIED BY THE MEXICAN DEPUTIES.

MACON, GA., *June* 3.

The express package received here to-day announces that the treaty has been ratified by the Mexican Chamber of Deputies. The vote was taken on the 17th ult., at a quarter past 6 o'clock P. M., and stood—yeas 51, nays 35—the majority being 16. No doubt existed that the vote would be approved in the other branch of Congress by a large majority.

WASHINGTON, *June* 4.

The despatch from the South which announces to you the confirmation of the peace news, adds the following from the New Orleans Delta:

"Orders have been issued, calling in all the outposts of the American army, which is expected to march for the coast between the 1st and 15th of June.

"General Persifor F. Smith has been appointed to superintend the embarkation of the forces at Vera Cruz."

CONGRESSIONAL.

We have thrown out our advertisements on the fourth page this week, to make room for the speech of Mr. Giddings, delivered in the House a short time since, and that of Mr. Hale on the Oregon bill, in the Senate, last Thursday.

The House adjourned on Tuesday till Friday; the Senate, from Monday till Thursday. Nothing, we presume, will be done till next Monday.

☞ This week, being pressed for time, we have made quite a free use of the brief reports in the *Sun* and *Clipper*, in making up our summary of proceedings in Congress.

☞ PROMPT RESPONSE—HOW IT CAN BE DONE.—A friendly subscriber writes:

"When I opened your paper of last week, and read a small printed document, and found that each subscriber getting one additional, would add 10,000 to the list, I immediately went in pursuit of one, got him, and you will find his money ($2) enclosed, for your paper one year."

Some men are constructed on the high pressure principle. They puff and blow, and heave and snort, like one of our Western steamboats. They "go ahead," it is true, but they take care to make a great ado about it, and cannot bear to move without advertising the world of the fact. Power without pother, motion without apparent effort, progress without noise, they cannot appreciate. Absence of "fuss" to them is proof positive of want of heart. The composure of conscious strength, the coolness of self-control, they mistake for indifference or insensibility.

The opposite of prudence is not valor, but rashness; and rashness is the offspring, not of courage, but inconsiderateness. Courage is more likely to be prudent, than imprudence is to be courageous.

Sympathy is best shown by acts. Words are cheap—deeds cost something. But there are those who love the world to see how sympathetic they can be. The idea that people will be looking on, quickens their sensibilities. Their eyes grow moist, their hearts melt, on the public stage. Such men are addicted to the cant of philanthropy; and, if they bestow charity, the thing is not done in a corner. The newspapers record every act, and, if rather tardy in their labor of love, a seasonable letter tells the whole story. The sympathy that sorrows for others so as to attract admiration to itself, is suspicious!

Some people are always in an agony. They are in love with misery. They recreate themselves by going about the world in search of horrors. If the reality be not bad enough, they dress it in the most hideous colors, so as to enjoy the luxury of being shocked at it. They regard with suspicion the hopeful man, and stubbornly reject every indication that their opponents are not worthy of the perdition to which they have consigned them. They battle against wrong, not so much because they are anxious to overthrow it, as because it arouses their wrath. Signs of a better day they scout, for a reformed world would leave them without any thing to minister to their keen taste for deformity.

Some men divide world into three classes—fools, knaves, and those who think just as they do.

It is delightful so to identify ourselves with an enterprise, that to pursue the interests of the one is to promote those of the other. This is egotism and public spirit combined. The former is exalted; the latter mightily stimulated by such an alliance. Statesmen are examples in point. They are in their country, and their country is in them. How fondly they cherish the illusion that their exaltation is the glory of their country. "Reformers," self-styled, become deeply penetrated with a sense of their identity with the cause. Rather, they identify the cause with themselves. Hence the importance of defending their reputation—for a shadow upon it is reflected upon the cause: the imputation must be repelled. Why, then, wonder that these reformers should be so often at loggerheads with each other? Is not the cause embodied in each, and is it not the dictate of the highest duty to defend it?

Pioneers of reform movements often fall into the shade, while "eleventh hour men" reap the harvest they have planted. The reason is, that few reformers are at once constructive and destructive. In the beginning, the great work to be accomplished is destruction: the reformer is thrown into an attitude of offensive antagonism to whatever *is*, and becomes so accustomed to a defiant position, that conciliation is out of his power. Circumstances change; public sentiment is meliorated; a corresponding modification of the means for carrying forward the reform is demanded; the pioneers cannot divest themselves of their old habits, proceed just as if no change had taken place, lose their influence; while new actors, appearing on the stage, are recognised as the true exponents of the movement. Blessed is he who, without abating one jot of the claims of a vital principle, knows how to accommodate himself to changing circumstances and conditions, and progressive movements of the public mind. "To everything there is a season—a time to plant and a time to pluck up that which is planted; a time to kill and a time to heal; a time to break down, and a time to build up; a time to rend, and a time to sew."

THE OREGON BILL—A PROTRACTED STRUGGLE.

Last week we mentioned a debate in the House on a proposition to take up, and dispose of, the Oregon Territorial Bill. It was the design of some to make use of the recent events in Oregon to force the measure through, without any discussion upon the question of the power of Congress over Territories. In the Senate, last Wednesday, a similar attempt was made. The bill reported in that body, from the Committee on the Territories, does not contain the anti-slavery clause of the Ordinance of 1787, *in form*. Last winter, a bill containing the clause passed the House, very many slaveholders voting for it on the final passage. In the Senate, it ought to have gone to the Committee on the Territories, but that not being constituted so as to suit Mr. Calhoun, the free State members, with their customary facility in all matters pertaining to slavery, acquiesced in its reference to the Committee on the Judiciary, which, in the Senate, is always composed of drilled supporters of the system. At the special instance of Mr. Calhoun, the obnoxious clause was stricken out, and the bill, thus mutilated, reported to the Senate. Mark!—the usual policy of the Government had been pursued by the House, in passing the measure with the anti-slavery clause. In this way, it was proposed to exempt the General Government, the common agent of the States, both slaveholding and non-slaveholding, from all responsibility for the extension of slavery. It was strictly, the *let alone policy*. But, the ultra slaveholders, led on by Mr. Calhoun, who boasted that the opposition in the House was instigated by himself, insisted upon the erasure of the anti-slavery clause, and upon keeping open the door to the entrance of slavery into territory under the exclusive jurisdiction of the General Government—a policy which would necessarily have involved the Government in actual support of the system. This would have been carrying out the doctrine of "Federal interference," so loudly condemned by the South, *in the abstract*.

Thus was the question of slavery thrust upon both Houses by Mr. Calhoun, and the bill, in consequence of this mutilation, performed by the Judiciary Committee under the direction of the South Carolina Senator, was embarrassed in its progress, and finally lost through the combined action of Mr. Calhoun and his friends, and prominent Whig Senators of New England. If the dreadful massacre in Oregon and the breaking out of an Indian war have been the consequences, as Mr. Benton says, of the failure to give Oregon a Territorial Government, the burden of the sin lies at the door of Mr. Calhoun and his particular friends: indeed, such was the charge distinctly made by Mr. Benton, in his letter to the people of Oregon.

The bill was called up last Wednesday in the Senate by Mr. Bright, of Indiana. An amendment moved by Mr. Benton was adopted, providing for raising a regiment of mounted volunteers, so as to afford succor immediately to the people of Oregon. This provision might have been introduced in the form of a distinct proposition, and would at once have received the assent of the Senate. Why it was appended to a bill for the establishment of a Territorial Government, we cannot understand, unless for the purpose of enabling the advocates of the measure instantly to overpower all opposition, and, under the plea of necessity, drive it through in such hot haste as to avoid the threatened discussion on the power of Congress in relation to slavery in Territories. Whether this was the reason or not, precisely such an argument was resorted to, when Mr. Hale arose and moved as an amendment the usual anti-slavery clause. Mr Hannegan denounced it. There were no slaves in Oregon—the provision was unnecessary—why seek by such a measure to delay the passage of a bill, absolutely necessary to save women and children from being slaughtered, Oregon from being devastated? Mr. Benton made a similar appeal. The butchery had commenced, and would the Senate suffer this measure, so necessary to stay the effusion of blood, to be delayed by the pestiferous question of slavery? This was a little too palpable. The first thing required was, a regiment of mounted volunteers, the next, provision for an Indian agency. Both could have been provided for by separate bills, which would have encountered no opposition. Why were they not introduced? Why tie them to a bill for establishing a Territorial Government, when it was well understood that that bill could not pass without a severe examination and a full discussion of the relations of Congress to Territories? No reason can be assigned, except a concealed purpose to prevent the discussion.

Mr. Hale made a handsome speech in vindication of his course, and in support of his amendment, administering a severe but polished rebuke to the apostate Senators from the State of Indiana, the freedom, intelligence, and prosperity of which, gloriously attested the wisdom of the Ordinance of 1787. Mr. Hannegan attempted a reply, but, felicitous as his extemporary efforts generally are, he made a signal failure. There was too much truth in Hale's rebuke; it was a thrust that no rhetoric could parry. Something was said about our glorious Union, and the torch of the incendiary, but it died away in the utterance. The day for this raw-head-and-bloody-bones oratory has gone by.

Meantime, a curious scene took place. Mr. Westcott, of the Calhoun guard, arose, and told Mr. Hale that his amendment was entirely unnecessary. The principle of it was already embraced in the 12th section of the bill itself. O, horror! And that bill had passed right under the eye of Mr. Calhoun's colleague, a member of the Territorial Committee. Mr. W. read the section, and, sure enough, the cunning Mr. Douglas, Chairman of the Committee, in pursuance of the Cass creed, had incorporated in it an express recognition of the existing laws of Oregon, one of which solemnly excludes slavery. Whew! Had the keen-sighted Mr. Westcott detected a hornet's nest, there could not have been a greater stir in the Chamber. Where was Mr. Douglas? An explanation was needed. He was absent—necessarily or conveniently, who shall say? At all events, he was not there to take care of his bill. Here was a "pretty fix" for the Cass men. They had just voted for his nomination at Baltimore, rejected the resolution of Mr. Yancey, asserting that the people of a Territory had no right to exclude slavery, and endorsed the great doctrine of their nominee, contained in the following declaration, made in his letter of December 24th, 1847, defining the extent of the rightful interference of Congress over territory:

"It should be limited to the creation of proper Government for new countries, acquired or settled, and to the necessary provision for their admission into the Union, LEAVING, IN THE MEAN TIME, TO THE PEOPLE INHABITING THEM, TO REGULATE THEIR INTERNAL CONCERNS IN THEIR OWN WAY."

These adroit politicians did not dream that the doctrine of their nominee would so soon be applicable. The people of the territory of Oregon, acting upon it, pass a law excluding slavery. Mr. Douglas, Chairman of the Committee on Territories, a sturdy supporter of General Cass, reports a bill recognising this law, in accordance with the same great doctrine, endorsed as it is by the universal Democracy, assembled in Convention at Baltimore. How could the Cass men help exulting at such an opportunity to demonstrate to the free States the excellence of their new creed? Did they rejoice? Never were men more alarmed. They could not have looked more anxious, had it been announced to them that their General was smitten with paralysis. Mr. Turney went to Mr. Hannegan—Mr. Butler held a *tête-a-tête* with Mr. Bright—Messrs. Allen and Dix yearned and were agitated—the Senate was all astir. In the name of our political prospects, and all the spoils, what is to be done? "The cat's out the bag." And Douglas sick! Recommit to the Judiciary Committee, says Davis, of Mississippi. That would have been sending the lamb to the jaws of the wolf. Four slaveholders and one Jerseyman would soon have despatched it. Mr. Westcott desired to introduce a substitute for the bill, designed principally to secure the pretensions of slaveholders. That's it—the South Carolina platform against the Baltimore platform—Calhoun against Cass. The 12th section recognises the right of the people of Oregon to legislate on their internal concerns, *even to the exclusion of slavery*. That is the Cass doctrine. The substitute of Westcott recognises the right of the people of Oregon to legislate on their internal concerns, *except as to slavery*. This is the Calhoun doctrine. The issue was distinctly, unequivocally made, and had there been any manliness in the Cass men, they would have met it instantly, and, in the Senate, as they had done in the Convention, voted down the Calhoun doctrine—maintained that of their leader. We never witnessed more shameless servility to slavery, more undisguised treachery to a professed creed. Mr. Bright moved at once that the subject be laid over till the next day at one o'clock, *pledging himself that such an alteration should be made as would be satisfactory*.

The next day the Senate assembled. Mr. Bright, poor man, had been disappointed. There had been consultation, but no decision. This revived our hopes. We began to think that General Cass was about carrying the day. Mr. Bright proceeded, like a culprit to the pillory, and at last reached the conclusion, by halting steps, that nothing could be done, although he did not know that he would have much objection to striking out the 12th section, provided it would not impair the bill. His indecision and blundering were disgraceful. Mr. Calhoun had his fiery eye fastened on him, and the fluttering Senator was as spell-bound as the helpless bird in the gaze of the serpent.

Just at this moment Mr. Hale made a most sagacious move, by withdrawing his amendment. He had been charged with putting in a firebrand; he would now take it out, reserving to himself the right to introduce it again if he thought proper. He was willing that the bill should pass as it was, but if the Senate struck out its anti-slavery clause, then he would re-apply the Proviso.

Had there been any self-respect among the Cass men, the measure could now have been carried. But some officious persons from the House came buzzing about the vacillating Senator, and the sagacious Mr. Bright, the independent Mr. Bright, intimated, gratuitously, that, on the whole, the friends of the bill would have no particular objection to striking out the 12th section, and he would make that motion. Mr. Calhoun saw that the prize was almost within reach, but understanding well the nature of a Servile, he pitched his demand even beyond all this. Striking out that section, he said, would not satisfy him. The laws of Oregon would still exist, and there must be protection for the slaveholder against them.

The general discussion then opened, Mr. Bagby leading off in support of the South Carolina platform. He was followed by Mr. Hale, in a speech which enchained the thronged galleries, being, in fact, the noblest effort he has made. He was interrupted by Mr. Foote, of Mississippi, who, in his peculiarly flippant and tumid style, undertook to read a lecture to the Senator from New Hampshire. The reply of Mr. Hale was brief, dignified, and pungent, appreciated by the Senate and the galleries, though thrown away, we fear, upon the Senator. He belongs to that class of men who never know when they have said a foolish thing, or their antagonists a wise one.

The Senate adjourned. Meantime the more sagacious and decided of the Cass men were apprized of the *faux pas* of Mr. Bright. We presume he was taken under dealings, for the next day, when the subject was brought up, he withdrew his motion to strike out the 12th section. Judge Berrien, a leading Whig Senator from the South, immediately renewed it. Much discussion ensued, during which Mr. Badger, of North Carolina, advocated the bill as it was, although he regretted that the friends of the measure had withdrawn the motion to strike out. Mr. Rusk, of Texas, opposed the bill, as an invasion of the rights of slaveholders. But the debates constituted but a small portion of the proceedings.

Mr. Calhoun, inexorable and watchful, was busy with members. Mr. Bright was besieged during nearly the whole session. Scraps of paper with hints and amendments were sent to him. Slaveholders called him from his seat and earnestly appealed to him in private.* If he would but consent, in behalf of the friends of the bill, to strike out the obnoxious section! Oh! what insulting importunity is invited by indecision! While this was going on, help to the right side came from an unexpected quarter. Mr. Niles, the Senator from Connecticut, obtained the floor, and delivered a manly, well-considered, most effective speech, against slavery, and the pretensions of its supporters, and in support of the principle of the Wilmot Proviso. He seemed to take a generous pleasure in endorsing the views and sustaining the position taken by Mr. Hale.

Gen. Houston now rose, and moved an amendment, which he hoped would reconcile all conflicting views. It was simply a proviso that the recognition of the laws of Oregon should be effectual, in so far as they did not impair any rights guarantied to the citizens of the United States, or any of them, by the Federal Constitution and laws. This did not impair the force of the bill, or vary it in the slightest degree; for, without such a proviso, any laws in Oregon conflicting with the laws or Constitution of the United States would have been null and void. But it afforded a convenient cover against Mr. Calhoun and his Southern partisans for such Senators from the slave States as wished, but feared, to vote for the measure.

Judge Berrien went over to General Houston, and suggested that he should extend his amendment so as to protect rights guarantied also *by the States*; but Texas declined. He knew what he was about; and so did Mr. Calhoun, for he arose in much agitation, showed that the proviso meant really nothing, and asked the General directly to give an explanation of what he understood by it. The Senator from Texas fully vindicated his reputation as an adroit tactician. He replied to Mr. Calhoun in a speech quite as shrewd as his amendment, which completely baffled the interrogator.

The amendment was adopted; a desire was manifested to push the measure through; it was evident that, were the question then taken, the motion to strike out the section would be rejected, and the bill pass. To obtain time was all-important to Mr. Calhoun, who protested against the attempt to force a vote at that session. He was sustained by Whig Senators—Messrs. Davis, of Massachusetts, Mangum, and Crittenden. After a hard struggle, a motion to adjourn prevailed, and time was thereby secured for private consultation and remonstrance, and the contrivance of other measures to get rid of the obnoxious clause.

* We watched the proceedings. We speak inferentially. Some eight or ten persons called him at different times from his seat, and appeared to be earnestly remonstrating with him, and appealing to him. No one, who knew the persons, could doubt the object.

The next day (Saturday) showed the result. Mr. Badger had given way, and now brought forward an amendment providing that nothing in the section should be construed to extend the anti-slavery principle of the ordinance of 1787 over the Territory! Judge Underwood, of Kentucky, who has hitherto been supposed to be liberal on this question of slavery, came out in decided opposition to the section. On the whole, the day was rather an ominous one for freedom.

Mr. Hale at last obtained the floor, and moved an adjournment, which prevailed.

During this doubtful struggle of four days, the Whigs kept silent, with the exception of Judge Berrien, who stood shoulder to shoulder with Mr. Calhoun, and Messrs. Badger and Underwood, who, on the last day, threw their weight in the scale of Slavery in Free Territory. Not a Whig Senator came to the rescue. Hale stood unsupported, save by Mr. Niles, a Democratic Senator. Daniel Webster did not give him even the benefit of his countenance. He went in and out of the chamber, paying apparently no attention to the debate, taking no part, in any way, in this protracted struggle to reverse the entire policy of the Government, and open the way for the introduction of slavery into the free Territory of Oregon. He could not have been more apathetic had the proceedings concerned merely the disposal of an anti-slavery memorial. At one time, indeed, not a single Whig member from a free State was in his place. On the Democratic side, the same treacherous timidity or apathy was evinced. Mr. Allen, of Ohio, who can thunder against abstractions, had no voice on this question. Senator Dix, upon whom some people fondly imagine has fallen the mantle of Silas Wright, with meek, placid face, was most busily engaged in writing letters. Liberty in a chamber of fifty-six members, twenty-eight of them from free States, a majority of them representing the Party of progress and the largest liberty, had but two advocates—Hale, an independent Liberty man, and Niles, an independent Democrat.

So much for this struggle in behalf of slavery. Is there nothing in it to arouse the country? Two years ago, the Wilmot Proviso was moved to a bill making an appropriation of three millions of dollars, to be used in the acquisition of territory on our Southwestern border. It was carried by a majority of thirty votes, Whigs and Democrats from the non-slaveholding States uniting in its support. Lost in the Senate, when the bill came up, last winter a year, in the House, the Proviso was again moved, and after a hard struggle, in which Executive and Party influences were arrayed against it, it was carried, but by a majority of only two or three.* The Senate rejected the Proviso, sent back the bill without it, and the battle was fought over again. This time, Slavery remained master of the field. The thirty majority in favor of the Proviso had fallen to a majority of five against it. Glorious progress, this!

But, there was one consolation. The Oregon Territorial Bill, with an anti-slavery provision in it, was passed by an overwhelming majority in the House, although it was killed in the Senate.

How stands the case now? The Wilmot Proviso is repudiated openly by all the leaders of the Democracy. It is abandoned by the great majority of their representatives in the House and in the Senate. Worse than this—so far from attempting to save the new territories on the Southwest from slavery, they are on the point of yielding up the only free territory on our Northwestern border to the ravages of the curse. And the Whigs are consenting. Ohio, and Michigan, and Indiana, and Illinois, and Wisconsin, and Iowa, have been bulwarked against the monster; but Oregon, lying in the same latitudes—Oregon, ever looked to as the magnificent home of the adventurous free laboring population of the country—Oregon, whose soil has never been wet with the blood of slavery—is to be abandoned to land sharks and negro drivers; and all because Mr. Calhoun wills it, and General Cass, intent alone on being the chief Spoils Distributer for four years, cannot venture to risk his game by opposing that inexorable despot.

Thank Heaven, we do not live in a so-called free State. Since our lot has been cast in this model Republic, we certainly would rather live among the rulers, than among the ruled—the slaveholders, than their white slaves. We abhor slavery, but we loathe servility. The Slaveholders are true to their constituents, to themselves, to what absurdly enough they regard as their rights and their interests: the Serviles are false to their constituents, the institutions and interests of their States, and true only to—*the spoils*.

We call the attention of the non-slaveholders of the country, who really prefer Liberty to Slavery, to these scenes in the Senate. That body is the stronghold of Slavery. Would that the whole nation could witness the spectacles there exhibited! The conduct of the supporters of General Cass on this occasion affords a clear indication of what the country has to expect from the elevation of that Northern man to the Presidency; and the behaviour of the Whigs is quite as full of evil portent. How sickening all the declamation about the claim of the North to furnish a President, so long as Principle is left out of the account. Though we certainly shall not *choose between evils*, beyond all doubt we should feel that the honor and interests of the country, aye, even the great interest, Freedom itself, would be safer in the hands of a slaveholder, than servile—of General Taylor, than General Cass. Let the old parties look to it; they may find in the end that "No Party" has carried off the prize, while their sole reward will be, the mire and filth in which they have wallowed.

THE QUESTION STATED.

No bill for the establishment of a Territorial Government in Oregon, without some anti-slavery safeguard attached to it, can pass the House of Representatives. No such bill, with the Wilmot Proviso appended to it, can pass the Senate. Unless, then, both Houses can agree on a bill in some way securing the Territory to freedom, without embracing the form of the Proviso, the people of Oregon can have no Government, except they set up one for themselves.

The bill now before the Senate is precisely such a one as we have just described. Its 12th section, in accordance with an unbroken series of precedents, recognises the existing laws of Oregon. One of these laws excludes slavery; so that the bill recognises the right of the people of Oregon to exclude slavery by legislative action. But this is precisely the doctrine of General Cass, in which he is fully sustained by the Democracy of the country rallied under his flag.

This bill was reported unanimously by the Committee on Territories. Mr. Hale has withdrawn his amendment providing that the anti-slavery clause of the ordinance of 1787 shall be incorporated in it. No objection is made to the recognition of any of the existing laws of Oregon but one, and that is the law excluding slavery. A slaveholding Senator has moved to strike out the entire section containing this recognition. The whole of the delay and debate and embarrassment has originated in the determination of Judge Berrien and slaveholding Whigs, and Mr. Calhoun and slaveholding Democrats, to expunge this section. They, and they alone, are responsible for the "abolition discussion," as it is called, improperly enough—(for it is a slavery propagandism discussion)—responsible for all the excitement, and discord, and delay; and if the bill be thus mutilated and then defeated in the House, as it will inevitably be, they, and they alone, will be chargeable with the blame and the consequences. To their determination to dismember a bill regularly and unanimously reported from a Standing Committee, recognising the legislation of the people of Oregon on their own internal concerns, so far as it does not conflict with the laws and Constitution of the United States—to dismember it so as to recognise their legislation in all points, except where it consecrates the soil of the Territory to Free Labor and Free Institutions, will be solely chargeable all the massacres, and robberies, and crime, and misery, that may follow the want of a legislative Government for Oregon.

We earnestly entreat the People TO LOOK TO THE SENATE.

☞ Many may recognise in the writer of the following, one kindred in genius as well as blood, to our Corresponding Editor:

For the National Era.

NIGHT AND DEATH.

The storm wind is howling
 Through old pines afar;
The drear Night is falling,
 Without Moon or Star.

The rous'd sea is lashing
 The bold shore behind,
And the moan of its ebbing
 Keeps time with the wind.

On, on through the darkness,
 A spectre, I pass
Where, like moaning of broken hearts,
 Surges the grass!

I see her lone head-stone—
 'Tis white as a shroud;
Like a pall hangs above it
 The low drooping cloud.

Who speaks through the dark night,
 And lull of the wind?
'Tis the sound of the pine-leaves
 And sea-waves behind!

The dead girl is silent—
 I stand by her now,
And her pulse beats no quicker,
 Nor crimsons her brow.

The small hand that trembled
 When lest in my own,
Lies patient and folded,
 And colder than stone.

Like the white blossoms falling
 To-night in the gale,
So she in her beauty
 Sank mournful and pale.

Yet I loved her! I utter
 Such words by her grave,
As I would not have spoken
 Her last breath to save.

Of *her* love the angels
 In heaven might tell,
While mine would be whispered
 With shudders in hell!

'Twas well that the white ones,
 Who bore her to bliss,
Shut out from her new life
 The visions of this;

Else, sure as I stand here,
 And speak of my love,
She would leave for my darkness
 Her glory above!

E. H. W.

ACCEPTANCE OF GENERAL CASS.

The letter of General Cass accepting the nomination of the Democratic Convention, we cannot find room for; nor is this greatly to be regretted. It may be summed up in few words: He is a good Democrat—goes for the "compromises"—believes in the power of the People to govern themselves—intends to make no further exposition of his political views—will not run a second term—and, while construing the Constitution strictly, thinks it ought to be accommodated to the progress of the age. We cordially concur with him in the opinion that the American People ought to set "an example of mutual respect for the motives of the contending parties," and that political contests should be waged "with as little personal asperity" as possible.

But the most remarkable thing about the letter is, its freedom from grammatical precision. Statesmen, we are aware, are not bound to be elegant scholars, or masters of style. People will pardon lack of rhetoric in words, if they display the rhetoric of deeds. But deficiency in both respects is rather a drawback. The truth is, it is time to call our public men to a reckoning for their corruptions and inelegances of language. We are all, editors and speakers, on this side of the Atlantic, too apt to express our thoughts loosely, obscurely, and incorrectly.

General Cass writes—

"I have carefully read the resolutions of the Democratic National Convention, laying down the platform of our political faith, and I adhere to them as firmly as I approve them cordially. *And while* thus adhering to them, I shall do so with a sacred regard to 'the principles and compromises of the Constitution,' and *with an earnest desire for their maintenance* 'in a spirit of moderation and brotherly love, so vitally essential to the perpetuity of the Union, and the prosperity and happiness of our common country'—*a feeling which has made us what we are, and which, in humble reliance upon Providence, we may hope is but the beginning of what we are to be.*"

Note the words placed in Italics. "*And while*" are words just as awkward as they are superfluous. "*With an earnest desire for their maintenance*"—the maintenance of what—"resolutions," or "principles and compromises?" "*A feeling which has made us what we are,*" &c. *Feeling* and *spirit* are not exact synonymes—the latter pointing to an affection of the mind more permanent and general than the former. Again, what definite idea is suggested by the phraseology—"and which (this feeling of moderation and brotherly love) in humble reliance upon Providence, we may hope, *is but the beginning of what we are to be?*"

The following sentence we have tried hard to analyze, but it defies our skill. The past, present, and future, the conditional and the absolute, "should," "could," "have," "had," and "has," are jumbled together in a style seldom equalled even by the General himself:

"If called upon hereafter to render an account of my stewardship, in the great trust you desire to commit to me, should I be able to show that I had truly redeemed the pledge thus publicly given, and had adhered to the principles of the Democratic party with as much fidelity and success as have generally marked the administration of the eminent men to whom that party has hitherto confided the chief executive authority of the Government, I could prefer no higher claim to the favorable consideration of the country, nor to the impartial commendation of history."

If great men would only be simple, what trouble they would spare their admirers. The General meant merely this: Good people, elect me President for four years, and the only praise I shall ask, will be—he followed faithfully in the footsteps of his illustrious predecessors.

Take another most luminous sentence:

"No party, gentlemen, had ever higher motives for exertion, than has the great Democratic party of the United States. With an abiding confidence in the rectitude of our principles, *with an unshaken reliance upon the energy and wisdom of public opinion, and with the success which has crowned the administration of the Government, when committed to its keeping*, (and it has been so committed during more than three-fourths of its existence,) what has been done, is at once the reward of past exertion and the motive for future, and, at the same time, a guarantee for the accomplishment of what we have to do."

There is no sense in this sentence. It cannot be relieved of its inelegance, but it could be amended so as to convey a definite idea, as follows:

"With an abiding confidence in the rectitude of our principles, an unshaken reliance upon the energies and wisdom of public opinion, and *in view* of the success which has crowned the administration of the Government when committed to the keeping of that party, (and it has been so committed during more than three-fourths of its existence,) we see in what has been done, at once the reward of past exertion, the motive for future, and a guaranty of final and complete success."

Again:

"We shall soon present to the world the sublime spectacle of the election of a Chief Magistrate by twenty millions of people, without *a single serious resistance* to the laws, or the sacrifice of the life of one human being."

Serious resistance, or a *single act* of serious resistance, we could understand, but "a *single resistance*" passes our learning.

Again:

"While the other, [party,] strong in its convictions of the intelligence and virtue of the people, believes that original power is safer than delegated, and that the solution of the great problem of good government consists in governing with the least force, and leaving individual action as free from restraint as is compatible with the preservation of the social system, *thereby securing to each all the freedom which is not essential to the well-being of the whole.*"

He means, we presume, "all the freedom which is not" *in conflict* "with the well-being of the whole." What he says has no meaning at all. General Cass is an author and a scholar—a fact which will appear incredible to transatlantic readers who may happen to see his letter accepting the Presidential nomination.

NEW PUBLICATIONS.

THE SKETCHES—THREE TALES. By the authors of "Amy Herbert," "The Old Man's Home," and "Hawkstone." New York: D. Appleton & Co. Philadelphia: G. S. Appleton.

This work is novel both as to its design and the object to which its benevolent authors propose to devote the profits of the publication. "It was suggested, as a Christmas amusement, that one of a party should draw a series of sketches which the rest should severally interweave into some short story or description. Subsequently a proposal was made, that a volume so framed should be published, with a view to increasing the funds for the erection of a church and several schools at Bonchurch, in which all the contributors felt a common interest." Thus the six sketches in the beginning of the volume are illustrated by three several stories. The stories are good, and the novelty of the design adds greatly to their interest. The volume is very handsomely got up.

LANCTON PARSONAGE, a tale, second part. By the author of "Amy Herbert," "Gertrude," "Margaret Perceval," &c. Edited by the Rev. W. Sewell. New York: D. Appleton & Co. Philadelphia: G. S. Appleton.

This book belongs to a class for which we entertain no great regard. It is pervaded by a kind of religious sentimentality which is offensive to sound taste. The principles it inculcates are right, but the way of doing it we do not like. It is rather prim and mawkish. True religion does not emasculate the character, or lower the standard of taste.

THE PEASANT AND HIS LANDLORD. By the Baroness Knorring. Translated by Mary Howitt. New York: Harper & Brothers. For sale by Franck Taylor, Pennsylvania avenue, Washington, D. C.

Our readers are so well acquainted with the translations of Mary Howitt, that little need be said in behalf of this work. To her we are indebted for some of the best specimens of the fictitious literature of northern Europe. Her spirited translations of the works of Frederica Bremer have done honor alike to the distinguished authoress and her sympathetic translator. The Baroness Knorring, although not equal to Miss Bremer, breathes the same spirit, and inculcates in a great degree the same high moral sentiments. In "the Peasant and his Landlord," we have a simple and touching narrative of the trials and triumphs of humble life. The authoress loves to "trace the annals of the poor." She sympathizes with them in their joys and sorrows, listens to the story of their wrongs, and most eloquently pleads their cause against their oppressors.

The hero of the work, in an hour of madness, goaded by wrongs such as man can least endure, commits, unintentionally, a murder. Partly in self-defence, and partly prompted by revenge, he knocks down his oppressor, and at the same time, hearing approaching footsteps, escapes through the mazes of the wood. Not until the discovery of the body, and the arrest of the man who approached at the moment the fatal blow was struck, is he made aware of the extent of his crime. The supposed criminal is tried and condemned. Meantime the real culprit suffers all the horrors of despair; and, after a long and agonizing struggle, resolves to confess the crime, and release the condemned man. This man is a villain of the deepest dye. He is under arrest for a crime committed against the murdered man, to whom he was a sworn foe, and was in the act of escaping from justice when he encountered the corpse in the wood. He is also the deadly enemy of the wretched culprit, and has repeatedly done him foul wrong; so that the virtue of the latter appears heightened. Still he could not, as an honest man, have done otherwise. But this is not all; he refuses mercy—he will not ask for pardon from the proper authorities. He thinks his death is necessary to expiate his sin. His mother, trembling with age, and weeping for her first-born, refuses also to ask his life. One to whom he is dearer than her own blood, steels her heart to the voice of Nature, and sacrifices all she loves to an inexorable faith. His pastor, to whose mistaken teachings we can clearly trace this infatuated devotion to a bloody prejudice, rejoices that they all deem "this sacrifice necessary to the welfare of the blessed soul." The book in its denouement may be thought to furnish a powerful appeal against capital punishment. The execution of the criminal seems like a brutal murder—far more revolting than the crime for which he suffers.

HISTORY OF THE GIRONDISTS. By Lamartine. Vol. III. New York: Harper & Brothers. For sale by F. Taylor, Pennsylvania avenue, Washington, D. C.

To the third volume of this history is prefixed an interesting memoir of its celebrated author. It is needless to say that this great work is distinguished by profound philosophy as well as brilliant painting. The conduct of Lamartine in the late Revolution shows that he has studied the history of the Girondists not in vain. Commenting upon their fall, he remarks: "There are two requisites for statesmen, in order to direct the great movements in which they participate: perfect intelligence of these movements, and the feeling of which these impulses are the expression in a people. The Girondists had not thoroughly one or the other."

This brief comment affords a clue to the cause of the success of Lamartine, and the triumph of the late Revolution over despotism in the first instance, and then over anarchy. He pre-eminently had perfect intelligence of the nature and extent of the revolutionary movement, and a profound sympathy with the feeling in which it originated. The intelligent decision and promptitude with which he and his associates acted, secured the control of the Revolution to the Moderate Republicans, and the energy and practical efficiency which their example inspired in the members of the National Assembly, have just enabled that body to put down the licentious and anarchical spirit which aimed to re-enact the violence that overwhelmed the weak and undecided Girondists.

This volume contains an episode on Charlotte Corday, who sacrificed herself to rid her country of the bloody Marat. A more brilliant, highly dramatic, deeply affecting narrative has not been written in modern times.

EDINBURGH REVIEW for April. New York: Leonard Scott & Co. For sale by W. Adam, Pennsylvania avenue, near Four-and-a-half street, Washington City.

The leader in this number is quite an erudite article on the genius of Plato. Another article furnishes some interesting reminiscences concerning Southey and Coleridge. There is a good article on Modern Quakerism; and another contains some peculiarly instructive facts in relation to certain proscribed races in France and Spain. In short, the number is an excellent one.

A UNIVERSAL HISTORY of the Most Remarkable Events of all Nations. New York: William H. Graham. For sale by W. Adam, Pennsylvania avenue, near Four-and-a-half street, Washington, D. C.

This is the reprint of a foreign work, intended to form a complete History of the World. It will be issued in numbers, at 25 cents a number, 20 to complete the work. The style in which it is got up is substantial, and agreeable to the eye. The American publisher says:

"In accordance with this requirement of history, the author not only arrays before the reader the great events of the human race, but also exhibits them in the light of those causes which called them into being. He contemplates man as a being of progress, advancing towards his high destiny, not by the accident of a blind chance, but in fulfilment of the wisely ordained plan of an overruling Providence. In his hands history is a powerful means of promoting moral and social culture, and of developing a love and adoration of the great Creator, by whom all things exist.

"The work, when completed, will embrace the history of the human race, from its infancy to the present time. The portion of Ancient History will extend to the fall of the Roman Empire, and will be embraced in about *four* numbers. The whole work will be completed in about twenty numbers, each of which will be issued at intervals of about a month.

"This work, which is to be published both at Leipsic and at London, is brought out here in advance of the European editions, in accordance with an especial arrangement with the author, whose name will therefore be withheld until after the publication abroad shall have taken place, when the name of the author will appear.

"*It will be the best work of the age, and should be in the hands of every man, woman, and child, that can read.*

"The work can be sent by mail to any part of the United States, at periodical postage. Any person who wishes to subscribe for it, can remit the publisher $1, and he will receive the whole of Ancient History, which will form a *complete volume*. He can then continue the work, if pleased with it, or stop it."

The publisher will oblige us by sending us Numbers 1 and 2.

For the National Era.

ONE DEPARTED.

BY MISS ALICE CAREY.

Blest inspiration of unworthy song,
 A heart of tender sadness woos thee back;
If in blind weakness I have done thee wrong,
 Accord me sweet forgiveness! Like the track
Of a bright bird, whereon soft notes are cast—
The time, the place, is where I saw thee last!

Life has been weary with me since we met,
 Though in it moments of deep joy there lie,
Soft, as we see in cloud-rifts, cold and wet,
 Blue shifting patches of the summer sky:
For oft, thy gold locks wet with my salt tears,
Thy gentle semblance from the dust appears!

In the cold mists of morn, at evening soft,
 When odors make the winds so heavy-sweet,
Stretching my arms out, I have called thee oft,
 And night has heard the soundings of my feet
Where the blue slabs of marble, icy chill,
Keep in thy breast life's azure rivers still!

Like the faint, dim vibrations of a lay,
 We sometimes half remember, half forget,
Thou, in the winding-sheet long wrapt away,
 Troublest my heart with wildering beauty yet
Nor have I ever met with mortal form,
Sweet as thy shadow to my sleeping arm!

Fade back to ashes, visitant divine,
 Unutterably radiant as thou art,
If ever smile of dewy lip, save thine,
 Hath touched the darkened ruins of my heart!
Thou wert in thy young life, and still dost seem
The sweet and passionate music of a dream.

Sleep seals thy gentle eyes, but we are wed;
 Thou wait'st my coming—shall I traitor prove
To the deep slumbers of the bridal bed,
 And the birth-chamber of immortal love?
No! as the sweet rain visits the pale bloom,
I will come softly to thee in the tomb!

MOUNT HEALTHY, OHIO.

THE NOMINATION OF GENERAL CASS.

While the *Union* is recording the favorable response of one portion of the Democratic Press to the nomination of General Cass, we may as well call attention to not a few unfavorable responses.

The Democrats of this place met on the evening of the 29th, to ratify the nomination, and stir each other up to good work. At the close of proceedings, they formed a procession, waited upon Messrs. Dix and Benton, successively, and called them out. An amusing report is given of Mr. Benton's reception of his visiters, and it would seem that he was not very cordial in his ratification. Mr. Dix was entirely non-committal.

"The Delegates of New York, he said, had gone home to consult with the Democracy by whom they were constituted, as to the measures necessary to sustain the honor and dignity of the State.

"He entertained an earnest desire, and had freely expressed it, that these consultations might result in maintaining the ascendency of the Democratic party in that great State. He had no doubt we should soon have a response from them, and he desired for himself to secure the Democracy of Washington, that no effort on his part would be spared to uphold the integrity of the Democratic party, and the ascendency of its principles."

The New York papers contain a manifesto from the Utica Delegates, stating the proceedings of the Baltimore Convention, explaining their course, and calling a State Convention of the Democratic party in New York:

"The State Convention, by which we were appointed, after accomplishing the purpose for which it was assembled, adjourned without delay. The Legislature is not in session, and will not again convene during the year, so that the Democratic members of that body cannot meet together in caucus to receive our report, (even if it were proper to make it to them,) or to recommend the election of a State Convention for the purpose.

"The State Convention which has been already called in conformity to time-honored usage of the Democracy of this State, to be held on the thirteenth of September next, for the purpose of nominating Presidential electors, as well as candidates for Governor and Lieutenant Governor, and which is, beyond all doubt, the only authority competent to make such nominations in a valid form, will assemble with regular and full powers.

"In the mean time, it is deemed highly expedient to collect and express the sentiments of the Democracy in regard to the course which ought to be pursued in the present emergency. With that view, the following resolution was adopted:

"*Resolved*, That a Convention, composed of one Delegate from each Assembly District, be, and is hereby, recommended to be held at the city of Utica, on Thursday, the 22d of June, at 12 M., for the purpose of receiving the report of the regular Democratic Delegates to the National Convention, and expressing their sentiments in regard to the action of that body in excluding New York from a participation in its proceedings, and for recommending candidates for the offices of President and Vice President, subject to the decision of the State Convention regularly called for the 13th of September, or to take such other action relating thereto as may seem advisable.

"And, for the purpose of choosing Delegates to the said Convention, it is further recommended, that meetings be held in the several Assembly districts, at the time and place at which they were respectively held, for the purpose of choosing Delegates to the recent Utica Convention, on the 14th of June next, unless the local committees shall designate a different time and place.

"We have thus laid before you, fellow-Democrats of New York, a plain and unvarnished account of the treatment you have received in the persons of your representatives, from Delegates from other States, with whom we were deputed to form a National Convention, and of the steps taken by us to protect your rights, and our own, in the several conjunctures in which we have been placed. To your calm and dispassionate judgment, to your justice, fidelity, and honor, we now refer this whole matter, and with the momentous interests, State and National, present and prospective, with which it is allied."

To this call, the radical journals of the State are responding with great enthusiasm. The New York *Globe* says, after the outrageous decision of the Baltimore Convention, "all obligation to support the nominees of the Convention ended. * * They cannot be elected. * * A revolution in parties is at hand. The honest of all parties will come together, and the Democracy of the Union will become purified."

The New York *Evening Post* says:

"The general disposition in this quarter in regard to the nomination made by the fragment of a Convention at Baltimore, is to consider it as a nullity."

The *Albany* (N. Y.) *Atlas* says:

"We believe we speak the sentiments of the Democratic masses of the State, when we say that they will regard this nomination as a thing concerning which they have no responsibility, which is not addressed to them, and concerns them not. They will take their own action in regard to the future. They are powerful enough to do so, as the intriguers and fanatical sectarians, who have broken the seal of the Democratic party and scattered its fragments, will find to their sorrow."

The *Troy* (N. Y.) *Budget* says:

"The Baltimore Convention has accomplished a feat which will long be remembered among the remarkable events in the political history of the country. It has broken up the Democratic party of the nation!"

The *Rochester* (N. Y.) *Republican* says:

"The nominations at Baltimore, under the circumstances, place the Democracy of this State in a position at once peculiar and entirely independent of all obligations thereto. The fact is so perfectly plain and undeniable, that it were presuming very little upon the popular intelligence, to attempt to make it plainer by reasoning."

The *Buffalo* (N. Y.) *Republican*, speaking of the determination to call a State Convention, says:

"We cordially approve of this determination, and hope it will be followed by prompt action on the part of the Democratic organizations throughout the State.

"Acquiescence, on the part of the Democracy of New York, in the decisions of a Convention,

the proceedings of which were characterized by a disregard of the usages of the party, by insult, outrage, and proscription, by a virtual avowal in favor of the extension of human slavery, and by the rejection of the chosen representatives of the Democratic masses of New York, would be alike humiliating and degrading, subversive of all party organization, and destructive to those principles of justice and freedom for which they have contended."

The *Hamilton* (N. Y.) *Reflector* says:

"We have witnessed Delegates from the Southern States demand the exclusion of the Democracy of this State, because they adhered to the principles of the Wilmot Proviso, and opposed the propagation of slavery in free territory. * * * In fact, we have witnessed the whole proceedings of that body conducted in such a manner as to preclude the possibility of uniting the Democracy of the Union in the support of its nominees."

The *Newburg* (N. Y.) *Telegraph* says:

"It may be regarded as unfortunate for the nominees that the Convention did not do its work better. By its action, no binding obligation is imposed upon the Democracy of New York.

* * * * * * * *

"Of what use is further subserviency on the part of the North to the South? The latter requires an unqualified and unconditional surrender by the former of the least interference or interest in the settlement and government of the Territories. It would really seem that the crisis predicted by Thomas H. Benton, in a letter written by him a little more than a year ago, has arrived, 'that the present organization of parties must be broken up, and a new party formed, bounded by geographical lines, and resting on the sole principle of slavery propagandism.'"

The *Utica* (N. Y.) *Democrat* says:

"The Democrats of New York, having taken no part in these nominations, will, so far as they are concerned, regard them *as utterly null and void.* They have been made by the combined action of the united slave interest of the South and the Conservatives of the North. Mr. Cass is the embodiment of both these interests. The men who have made these nominations do not expect that they will be supported by the Democrats of New York."

The *Niagara* (N. Y.) *Cataract*, speaking of the State Convention called to nominate candidates for the Presidency and Vice Presidency, says:

"We should have preferred that our delegates to Baltimore, chosen as they were to speak the voice of New York in nominating a President, should have taken this duty upon themselves. A more patriotic body, more devoted Democrats, a more able and distinguished body of men, cannot be selected in the State of New York or any other, and we should have had the most implicit confidence in their wisdom and judgment."

The *Onandaga* (N. Y.) *Standard*, in reference to the decision of the Baltimore Convention, says:

"Such a disposition of the question is a gross outrage upon the Democracy of the State, and will never be countenanced here. *It leaves but one course for us to pursue. We have had no voice in the nomination, and cannot support it.*"

The *Oswego* (N. Y.) *Palladium* is indignant at the action of the Baltimore Convention, copies the call for a State Convention, and sustains it.

The *Cayuga* (N. Y.) *New Era* says:

"We shall publish the proceedings in full as soon as they appear, and we do not hesitate to say that a more gross violation of the rights of the Democracy of this State, as well in excluding her from the Convention as in selecting a candidate whose principles are entirely adverse to theirs, could not have been perpetrated, and will arouse New York to a sense of her position, and of the indignity offered to her, that will make the doughfaces of the North tremble. Lewis Cass stands pledged against the preservation of freedom in free territory, and New York must be degenerate, indeed, if she does not put her mark of condemnation upon him."

The *St. Lawrence* (N. Y.) *Republican* says:

"The result opens a new era, when the Democracy have but two alternatives to choose between: slavery propagandism and intolerance on the one hand—and freedom, free soil, and free speech, on the other. The Democracy of New York have chosen the latter; and, as will be seen, a convention is to be called at Utica, on the 22d day of June next, to nominate candidates for President and Vice President of the United States.

* * * * * * * *

"She (New York) has had no part or lot in the nomination of General Cass; *neither will she support him.* The rights of New York have been ruthlessly crushed, and her Democracy insulted. Every Democrat in the State of New York, whose representative voice was stifled in that body, will feel that insult, and indignantly repel it."

The *Democratic* (King's county, N. Y.) *Advocate*, speaking of the State Convention, says:

"The call to elect delegates will in due time be made, and we doubt not but that they will meet with a hearty response from all who have regard to the dignity of the Empire State, and of her delegates, and who wish to sustain the rights of true Democrats."

The *Delaware* (N. Y.) *Gazette* says:

"Whatever may be the merits of those candidates, nominated by other States, it remains to be determined whether the Democracy of this State will ratify the nominations and support the candidates."

The *Catskill* (N. Y.) *Recorder* says:

"The bargain by which Cass sold himself to the slave interest, and pledged himself to veto any bill to limit the extension of slavery over free territory, has been consummated. But, thank Heaven, New York has no part or lot in the matter. Her voice was not heard. No vote was given either by her genuine or her spurious delegates; and to her the proceedings of the Convention are a dead blank—a complete nullity."

The *Ontario* (N. Y.) *Messenger* says:

"The 'without a why or wherefore' delegates who compose the firm of 'Dr. Brandreth & Co.,' and who

'Bent the pregnant hinges of the knee'

to the dictation of the '*test*' makers of the South, will soon learn whether the imbecile and subservient course they have taken is calculated to meet the approbation of the independent, the unterrified and invincible Democracy of the Empire State—a Democracy which, we trust in God, will always be found on the side of Human Liberty and Jeffersonian Democracy."

The *Chemung* (N. Y.) *Jeffersonian* says:

"The extent of cordiality with which these nominations will be received is as yet uncertain. But one thing is sure—the feelings and preferences of the Democrats of New York, and, in fact, of the whole North, have been too utterly disregarded, and too severely trampled upon, by the course of this Convention, to enter with any great degree of zeal and energy into the campaign, to struggle for, and elevate to the highest gift of the nation, men who hold our dearest interests and principles so lightly as to *bargain* them for Southern popularity and support."

The *Sandusky* (O.) *Daily Mirror* says:

"The voice of the great State of New York, of her noble Democracy, has not been heard in making this nomination. It is *not*, therefore, the nomination of a Democratic *National* Convention, such as the delegates were sent to Baltimore to make, and is of no binding obligation upon the Democracy of the nation, or any part of it, except so far as they choose to ratify it.

"The Democracy of New York, it is believed, will have a candidate in the field, and the Democracy of other free States will probably unite with them.

"The Whig party will probably nominate Henry Clay, General Taylor, or General Scott. If so, a Democratic candidate, planted upon the doctrines of the New York Democracy, viz: *Free soil, free men, free speech,* and *free commerce,* would carry the North against all opposition, and probably go into the Presidential chair."

The *Charleston* (S. C.) *Evening News* says:

"It is our opinion that this nomination will not receive the assent of the State of South Carolina; and we have no doubt that the State will, in its primary assemblies, disavow the act of the individual who has claimed to represent her in the Convention. No one who sat in that assembly was authorized to cast her vote for General Cass or any other candidate. She is not bound, therefore, in honor or principle, to abide the decision of that body. The State is untrammelled to pursue that course which her sense of duty, under the Constitution, and her own rights and interests, may dictate. The State of South Carolina has manifested her repugnance to sharing in a nomination of the Chief Magistrate of the Union, by bodies not recognised by the Constitution, and without the sphere of its regular action."

PHONOGRAPHIC COMET.—Nos. 2 and 3 have been brought to our notice. A phonographic friend, who takes all of Pitman's phonographic periodicals, assures us that, in point of beauty of execution, the Comet far surpasses them all; and that it is in every respect worthy of the patronage of those who feel an interest in the Printing and Writing Reform.

Published monthly by E. Webster, Cincinnati, at $1.50 per annum, *in advance.* *

AN EXTRAORDINARY HYPOCHONDRIAC.—There is at present residing at Johnstown, county Kilkenny, a gentleman of the name of Darmody, who, in one of those singular freaks of imagination, fancied that, by constantly partaking of the flesh of geese, he will become possessed of a perfect coating of feathers, under which delusion he makes purchases of enormous quantities. This is a fact well known in the locality.

Limerick Chronicle.

"LIBERTY OR DEATH."

"'Tis easy, my husband!" was the dying exclamation of the Roman heroine, as she drew the dagger from her bosom, and handed it to her husband, to perform upon himself the same fearful office of suicide. Her devotion and courage have been the theme of classical admiration. Who has not felt his pulse beat quick at the story of the sacrifice of Virginia by her own father, before the tribunal which had just pronounced her the slave of Claudius, and resigned her to the lust of the brutal patrician!

An event has just occurred in our own country, which transcends in tragic interest those passages from the history of the heroic age of Rome—one to which scarcely the burning words of Alfieri or the vigorous lays of Macauley could do justice. The newspapers of the West give the terrible details in few words, and generally without remark. Connected as it is with the despotism of slavery, political partisans dare not accompany the fact with the commentary which instinctively suggests itself. Safer by far was it for the Roman Tribunes to denounce the outrage when committed by Appius Claudius, even when the tyrant exercised supreme power in the city, and before the return of Virginius to avenge his daughter's wrongs, than it is now for a Whig or Democratic editor to speak out the language of an honest and generous heart, in view of the tragic horror which they have placed upon record in their pages.

It appears that a "Mr. Mullen, of Grant county, Kentucky," sold a man and his wife to a negro-trader, who was seeking slaves for the market of New Orleans. They had one child only, and this the trader did not want. The poor creatures dreaded to be sold; they had been faithful in their service, and the man, especially, was noted as one of those "contented slaves who wouldn't take their liberty if they had the offer of it," of which so much has been said by Northern apologists for slavery. To induce them to go more willingly, the trader cunningly suggested that it would be best to let the child remain with them until he had made up his cargo, and was ready to start down the river, when it could be taken from them and sent back to Grant county. This diabolical advantage of parental affection was accordingly taken, and the three slaves were brought to Covington on the 18th ult., and placed in the jail for safe-keeping. Just before entering the jail, the parents learned by some means the cruel trick that had been played upon them, and that they were to be sold away from their child in a few days.

The agony and horror which followed this revelation are known only to God. The wretched pair looked upon each other and upon their child. They were about to leave the sole pledge of their love in the hands of a master who had proved himself cruel and heartless. They were themselves soon to be sold again, perhaps to different owners, and driven by the whip on separate plantations, never to see each other again, never to hear the voices of old friends and relatives, and at last to die exhausted in the cotton-row, or neglected in the cheerless hut, and to have, when all was over, a brute's burial. From this awful destiny, which their imagination all through that miserable night painted on the black wall of the dungeon, there was but one door of escape—*death!* Who marvels that they sought it?

In the calmness of their great despair, they deliberately resolved to die together. The mother cut the throat of the child, and then gave the knife to her husband, who killed her, and then attempted to complete the sacrifice by cutting his own throat. He was found alive, but it was thought he could not recover.

Upon whom, in the sight of truth and reason, rests the guilt of this terrible immolation? Not, surely, upon the poor victims themselves. We may pity, but we cannot condemn them. We leave them to Him to whose mercy they have so solemnly appealed from the cruelty of man. The damning sin of this tragedy lies at the door of those who thrust upon them the terrible alternative—who compelled them to choose between the separation, the shame, the stripes, the long agony of slavery, and a sudden and violent death—the freedom of the grave!

But the responsibility is not confined to the men directly concerned in buying and selling the husband and wife; nor to those who, living in slave States, have enacted or give active support to the laws which authorize the holding of man as property. The people of the whole Union are responsible. The blood of this sacrifice rests on the garments of the individuals who compose the State and the church, North as well as South. Congress possesses the constitutional power to prohibit that inter-State slave trade, in the prosecution of which the Covington slave dealer drove his victims to the dreadful extremity of suicide. That this power has not been exerted is alone owing to the fact that the people represented in Congress have not demanded its exercise.

The free States hold this whole matter in the hollow of their hands. They are the majority, despite the slaveholding representation of property vested in human beings. With a will to put a stop to the domestic traffic in slaves, the power would not be wanting. Whenever the will of the people of the free States is unequivocally expressed in favor of the repeal of all laws of Congress sanctioning slavery, and for such a regulation of the traffic between the States as shall put an end to the loathsome occupation of the negro trader, their delegation in Congress (now, we fear, but faithful representatives of the servility, prejudice, and indifference of the mass of their constituents on the question of slavery) will, whether from choice or from necessity, lose no time in making that will the law of the land.

J. G. W.

IMPORTANT FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE.

The steamer United States arrived at New York on the morning of the 31st ultimo, from Liverpool on the 18th ultimo, with news four days later than that brought by the Hibernia. The "Niagara" arrived at Boston on the 2d instant, with Liverpool dates to the 20th.

The most important intelligence respects an extensive conspiracy in Paris and France, to put down the National Assembly, and establish a Reign of Terror. The mob succeeded so far as to drive the members from their seats, and commence the organization of a Provisional Government, but its triumph was of short duration. The National Guards rallied; the Government acted with great vigor and decision; the nests of the conspirators were broken up; some two hundred arrests were made, and the ringleaders safely lodged in prison. Order and tranquillity were soon restored, and the revolution was saved.

The mediation of England with the Germanic League, Prussia, and Denmark, is reported to have failed. The Danes were awaiting a Swedish reinforcement.

In Ireland, the trial of Smith O'Brien has been brought to a close by the disagreement of the jury, and the prisoner is discharged.

Lord Ashburton died on the 13th ultimo, in the 74th year of his age.

A bloody battle has been fought under the walls of Verona, between the Sardinians and Austrians, in which the former were worsted, but the loss of the latter was very heavy. A French army is ready to enter Italy, should Charles Albert be overcome; but it is anticipated that the Italian forces will need no assistance.

"Polish nationality," it is said, "has received its death blow on the plains of Posen. Undisciplined peasants, under the command of Mieroslawski, have capitulated to the Prussian general, and their brutal outrages on person and property have alienated their German sympathizers. The reorganization of the Polish nation is at the present moment as visionary a scheme as the restoration of Austrian supremacy in Lombardy, unless indeed the mysterious Autocrat of the North should think fit to propose it, or the French Executive Government be coerced into active efforts in its support."

INSURRECTION IN PARIS—ARREST OF THE RINGLEADERS.

At ten o'clock on Monday morning the populace, composed of the clubs, the *atteliers nationaux*, the provincial delegates, and other violent Democratic associations, began to assemble on the Place de la Bastile; and by half-past eleven upwards of fifty thousand had been convened. They were marshalled under banners, and marched in procession along the line of the Boulevarde, by the Place de la Concorde, to the Chamber, the numbers augmenting as they proceeded. The most conspicuous figure in the procession was M. Louis Blanc, who had his place about the centre of it, amidst the "ouvriers nationaux," by whom he was loudly cheered. The approaches to the Chamber were occupied by large bodies of the National Guard and troops of the line. The populace that formed the procession shouted constantly, "Vive la Pologne!" "Vive la République Universelle!" but appeared to awaken no sympathy with the crowd that filled either side of the Boulevards, who rather treated the affair with apparent ridicule.

On arriving at the bridge, finding the passage interrupted, the procession turned towards the Chamber, and arrived at the gate in the Place Lafayette. General Courtais—who, justly or unjustly, is suspected of being a party to the affair—had previously ordered the bayonets to be taken from the muskets. Some of the people seeing this, were encouraged to escalade the railings; others followed, and the court of the Chamber was soon filled. General Courtais then advanced to them with conciliating language; but, in fine, the gates were soon forced open, and the populace entered the Chambers.

At half-past two o'clock, after the populace had thus been collected round the Chamber for some time, the "rappel" was beaten in all the surrounding quarters of Paris. Before four o'clock the National Guard, in immense numbers, were everywhere under arms, and marching towards the Chamber. The esplanade of the Invalides and the quays, and other avenues connecting it with the Chamber, were completely filled with these troops, mingled with the National Guard. The legions of the National Guards were pouring in immense bodies over the bridge, and the vestibule and court of the Chamber were completely filled with the Guard Mobile.

"The Assembly met at twelve o'clock, and proceeded with its ordinary business.

"A confusion of cries from without were heard, and the representatives all rose from their places.

"The hussiers call 'En place!' 'En place!'

"M. Louis Blanc entered the hall at this moment, and at the same time the doors of the galleries were forced open. On all sides, the populace precipitate themselves into the hall. The ladies in the gallery fly, screaming with terror. All order ceases.

"M. Ledru Rollin endeavored to obtain a hearing. He is scarcely listened to. He alluded to the justice of their demand in favor of Poland; spoke of the admirable good sense of the people of Paris; declared that the people had set their grievances before the Assembly with justice, and that without doubt they would be properly attended to. But he would appeal to their sense of justice, if it were possible to deliberate in such a tumult. He called on them to withdraw on the instant, and allow the National Assembly to do its duty, and decide what was to be done. [He was loudly applauded, except at the close, when murmurs arose.]

"M. Louis Blanc alone obtains attention. He supplicates the people not to violate its own sovereignty in that of the Assembly. He mounts upon the bureau.

"M. Odilon Barrot is observed to maintain a perfect composure.

"The uproar which now ensued was such as no description can convey an adequate idea of. The tribune was successively occupied by representatives and delegates from the clubs, many of whom were personally unknown to the reporters, and resolution after resolution was proposed, the terms of which it was impossible to collect, and which were received by mere shouts or exclamations. One proposition, made by Barbès, was, that any one ordering the *rappel* to be beaten, should be declared a traitor to the country. Another proposition, which is reported to have been carried by acclamation, was, that the Chamber should be dissolved, and that a new Government should be formed, consisting of MM. Blanqui, Raspail, Louis Blanc, Barbès, and Ledru Rollin.

"Another motion was, that Barbès should be declared Minister of War; carried of course by acclamation.

"Barbès moved, that the aristocrats should be taxed to the amount of 1,000 million of francs.

"Blanqui proposed that justice be immediately taken on the assassins of Rouen.

"Barbes made his motion with a drawn sword in his hand."

After these tumultuous proceedings, the bulk of the populace proceeded to the Hotel de Ville to proclaim the new Provisional Government. Barbes was one of the first who entered the Hotel de Ville, with a dozen of his friends. He mounted on a table placed in one of the rooms in the right wing, and read the names of the members of the Provisional Government which he had announced to the Chamber. Meanwhile the National Guard was advancing in strong force. A panic was raised amongst the hundreds who occupied the hotel, and a cry, "To arms!" was raised in vain. Barbès and his friends shut themselves into the small room, and posted several armed persons at the door. At this moment Lamartine arrived, completely overpowered with fatigue and heat. Energetic measures were then taken. The 5th and 7th batteries of the artillery of the National Guard, commanded by their *chef d'escadron*, formed the *haie* in the passage which conducted to the place where Barbes, Albert, Thoré, and others, were placed. They were surrounded and taken into custody. Albert was taken in the same manner; his features exhibited much internal emotion, and were much distorted. M. de Lamartine quitted the Hotel de Ville in the midst of popular acclamations. The persons who were in the room with Barbès were also arrested, and conducted to prison. These arrests are said to amount to at least sixty. On many persons were found pistols and daggers, and, on some, letters from the chiefs of the plot. Cries of "Vive l'Assemblée Nationale!" were shouted on all sides.

We now return to the National Assembly, which continued its sittings in the evening, after the members of the Executive Commission had left for the Town-hall. The tone of the Assembly was firm and dignified. Whilst they were discussing the propriety of prosecuting General Courtais and Barbès, MM. Garnier Pagès and Arego arrived. The former announced that the conspirators were in prison, and that the clubs which deliberated with arms, and openly spoke of attacking the Assembly, should be dissolved.

A decree of the Executive Commission was then read, appointing M. C. Thomas commander-in-chief of the National Guard of Paris. M. Lamartine then briefly addressed the Assembly, stating that justice should take its course, and that the people everywhere declared their devotion to the National Assembly. It was resolved that MM. Albert and Barbes should be prosecuted. On Monday night all the clubs were closed, and occupied by the military. At eight P. M. all danger had passed away. The people were enthusiastic on behalf of the Assembly, which was still guarded by a large force of infantry, cavalry, and artillery. The Hotel de Ville and the principal streets were illuminated. M. Caussidiere, prefect of police, is dismissed. Huber, who proclaimed the Provisional Government in the hall of the Assembly, has been arrested. Sobrier was taken into custody at the very moment he was expaining the form of the Provisional Government, of which he was a member. Blanqui had not yet been taken.

The *Daily News* applauds the judicious conduct of M. Lamartine throughout the affair, but fears that "the reaction may go so far—nay, threatens to do so—as excluding not only the Ledru Rollins, the Louis Blancs, and the Flocons, from power, but even to ostracise Lamartine, or punish him for his evident desire still to conciliate the people and their leaders."

ABOLITION OF SLAVERY IN THE FRENCH COLONIES.

The following decree has just been published:

"The Provisional Government, considering that slavery is an attempt against the dignity of man; that, by destroying the freedom of man, it suppresses the natural principles of right and duty; that it is a flagrant violation of the republican dogma of liberty, equality, and fraternity; that unless effective measures follow closely the proclamation already made of the principle of abolition, deplorable disorders may arise in the colonies, decrees—

"1. Slavery shall be entirely abolished in all the colonies and possessions of France, at the end of two months after the promulgation of this present decree in each of them. From the promulgation of this present decree in the colonies, all corporal punishment, all sales of non-liberated persons, shall be absolutely interdicted.

"2. The system of engagements for periods of time, established at Senegal, is suppressed.

"3. Governors or commissaries-general of the Republic are charged with applying the measures suitable for insuring emancipation at Martinique, Guadaloupe and its dependencies, the island of Reunion, Guyana, Senegal, and the other French settlements on the western coast of Africa, the island of Mayotte and its dependencies, and Algeria.

"4. All slaves condemned to afflictive or correctional punishments for acts which, if imputed to freemen, would not have been visited with these punishments, are pardoned. All individuals transported as an administrative measure, are recalled.

"5. The National Assembly shall fix the indemnities to be granted to the colonists.

"6. The colonies purified from slavery, and the possessions in the Indies, shall be represented at the National Assembly.

"7. The principle that the soil of France emancipates the slave who touches it, is applied to the colonies and possessions of the Republic.

"8. In future, every Frenchman, even when in a foreign country, is interdicted from possessing, purchasing, or selling slaves, and from participating, directly or indirectly, in any traffic or dealing of this nature. Every infraction of these provisions shall involve the loss of the quality of a French citizen. Nevertheless, Frenchmen who shall find themselves affected by these provisions shall be allowed three years to conform, from the time of the promulgation of this decree. Those who may become possessors of slaves, by inheritance, gift, or marriage, shall, under the same penalty, emancipate or alienate them within the same delay, from the day on which their possession shall have commenced.

"9. The Minister of the Marine and Colonies and the Minister of War are each, so far as concerns him, charged with the execution of this present decree. Done at Paris, in Council of Government, this 27th of April."

ABOLITION OF SLAVERY IN THE PORTUGUESE COLONIES.

The following is a decree of the Government of Portugal, appointing a committee to prepare a plan for the total abolition of slavery in all the Portuguese possessions:

"MARINE DEPARTMENT.—The slave-trade being already prohibited by law and treaties in all the Portuguese possessions, and it being also in accordance with the true spirit of justice and equity, on which all good policy rests, that an end should be put to negro slavery, still tolerated and permitted in these possessions, the public weal requiring, however, that so important an alteration in the social state of those countries should be made with such prudence and forethought that fortunes may not be suddenly destroyed, nor the grant of liberty serve as an occasion for the slaves to abuse that benefit, which, though entirely conformable to the principles of humanity, cannot but entail a serious sacrifice on the State, as well as on the slave-owners—I am pleased to appoint a committee of the following members:

"The Councillors and Honorary Ministers of State, Jose de Sousa Pinto de Magalhaes and Ildefonso Leopoldo Beyard; the Councillor Antonio Ramalho de Sa, Judge of the Tribunal of Goa; the Councillor Jose da Costa Carvalho, captain in the navy, the merchant of Lisbon, Faustino da Gama; the lieutenant in the navy Jose Joaquim de Andrade Pinto; the Bachelor Carlos Zeferino Pinto Coelho de Castro; the first of whom shall act as president, and the last as secretary; which committee, taking as a basis the principles of equity and justice, and keeping in view the laws and practice established in the Portuguese possessions, and also the lessons of experience offered by those regions where slavery has been abolished, and other considerations which ought to be attended to, shall propose to me the most efficacious and proper practical means of carrying into effect the emancipation of slaves existing in the Portuguese ultramarine territories, and shall prepare the necessary projects of law and regulations for carrying out that object.

"The Minister of Marine, &c.

"Palace of the Necessidados, 14th April, 1848.

"RAINHA.

"BARAO DE VILLA NOVA DE OUREM."

THIRTIETH CONGRESS.

FIRST SESSION.

MAY 31.

SENATE.—Wm. K. Sebastian, appointed to fill a vacancy in the Senate, occasioned by the death of Mr. Ashley, appeared, qualified, and took his seat.

Among petitions presented was one by Mr. Hale, in favor of removing the seat of Government to Cincinnati, Ohio.

Mr. Mason offered a resolution, which was adopted, calling for such further information as the President may have in his possession respecting the French revolution.

Mr. Atchison's joint resolution for adjournment of Congress from 1st July to October, came up. After debate, it was postponed till Monday week.

After the transaction of some unimportant business, a bill providing for the establishment of a Territorial Government in Oregon was taken up.

Mr. Benton submitted an amendment, which was accepted, authorizing the President to accept the service of one regiment of volunteer soldiery, to serve for one year.

Mr. Hale offered an amendment, touching the question of slavery.

Mr. Benton urged speedy action for the protection of the inhabitants of Oregon, and opposed connecting slavery with the subject.

Mr. Hale, in advocating his amendment, said he should stand to his position, though it resulted in severing the Union of the States.

Mr. Hannegan answered Mr. Hale's remarks, and urged prompt action upon the bill.

Mr. Jeff. Davis desired that the raising of troops should form a separate bill, so that they might be forthwith raised, as no one seemed opposed to that measure.

After further debate, the bill was laid aside till to-morrow.

The Indian appropriation bill was taken up.

Mr. Atchison withdrew the amendment indemnifying Colonel Johnson for erection of schoolhouses.

Mr. Bell desired to address the Senate, but, owing to the restlessness of Senators, on his motion, the bill was laid aside.

The Senate then held a brief Executive session, and adjourned.

HOUSE.—Mr. Cumming introduced a bill declaratory of the rights of naturalized citizens of the United States, and to protect them in the peaceful exercise of the enjoyment of their rights and privileges, against the acts and interference of foreign Governments and their diplomatic agents; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary. [This bill is supposed to protect Major Tochman, as counsel for the heirs of Kosciusko, against the interference of M. de Bodisco.]

Mr. Outlaw, from a select committee, reported a bill to provide for the families of those who were killed or died from wounds received, or disease contracted, or other casualties occasioned while in the service of the United States in Mexico. The widow, or, if no widow, the child or children, under sixteen years of age, of a commissioned officer, to receive half-pay for five years. Those of non-commissioned officers, musicians, or privates, $10 a month, for five years. The bill was referred to the Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union.

Mr. Strohm, from the Committee on Public Expenditures, made a report, reviewing the report of the Secretary of the Treasury on the finances. He said that errors were discovered in it, and it was proper they should be known to the country.

The minority of the committee said that they had not had time to make a counter report, and asked for further time.

A debate took place, which was terminated by the expiration of the morning hour.

The House took up the bill to regulate the appointment of clerks in the Executive Departments, providing that a board shall be appointed to examine into the qualifications of probationers.

Mr. Johnson, of Tennessee, said that, in the last Congress, there were only twenty working men—persons not lawyers; and that the latter class had a greater amount of influence than any other. He desired that farmers and working men should receive their full share of the public offices; and, in order to accomplish the object, he moved an amendment, that the offices be apportioned among the several States, according to the ratio of representation.

Mr. Hammons, of Maine, undertook to defend the lawyers against the attacks of Mr. Johnson, and said that it was an insult to the People to say that they were controlled by lawyers.

Mr. Holmes, of South Carolina, made a remark which caused laughter, to the effect that the gentleman from Maine, a lawyer, was arrayed against Mr. Johnson, a tailor. As they were both engaged in making *suits*, he hoped there would be no serious difficulties.

Further debate ensued, and, when it was concluded, Mr. Johnson's amendment was rejected by a vote of—yeas 64, nays 90.

The bill was then passed.

Mr. Haralson reported, from the Committee on Military Affairs, a bill to suppress Indian hostilities in Oregon, and other purposes.

And the House adjourned.

JUNE 1.

SENATE.—In the absence of the Vice President, Mr. Atchison was chosen President *pro tem.*

Mr. Allen presented sundry resolutions passed by the Legislature of Ohio, respecting the improvement of harbors, &c.; favoring Senator Corwin's course respecting the Mexican war, &c.

On motion of Mr. Jeff. Davis, 1,000 extra copies of the report of the Regents of the Smithsonian Institute were ordered to be printed.

A bill from the House, refunding money advanced by States in equipping volunteers, was amended and passed.

The Indian appropriation bill was taken up, and, after some debate, laid aside.

The bill organizing a Territorial Government in Oregon was taken up. The question pending being upon Mr. Hale's amendment regulating slavery, he withdrew it. Other amendments bearing upon the same question were withdrawn, with a view to final action upon the bill, when Mr. Hale, fearing his object might be defeated, desired to renew his amendment.

Mr. Calhoun made some remarks in explanation of the compromise of the Constitution.

Mr. Dickinson argued in favor of the citizens of Territorial Governments controlling the matter.

Mr. Bagby denied the right, either in the General or Territorial Governments, to prohibit citizens of the States moving, with their slave property, into such Territory.

Mr. Miller made some remarks, and was followed by Mr. Foote—the latter desiring to avoid discussing slavery, lest it should weaken the political prospects of his party.

Mr. Hale replied to previous remarks, and placed himself upon the ordinance of 1787, as founded upon the bill organizing the Territory of Iowa, and desired alone to engraft it upon this bill. He then went into a most energetic and highly pictured abolition speech.

Mr. Foote rose and made some strong personal allusions to Mr. Hale's "fraternizing with white and black sisters and brothers," at a breakfast, while recently on an Eastern visit.

Mr. Hale replied by saying he could not so far forget the respect due to the Senate as to retort.

After some explanatory remarks between Messrs. Foote and Hale, the matter was dropped, and the Senate adjourned.

HOUSE.—To-day, the debate commenced yesterday on printing 10,000 extra copies of the report of the Committee on Public Expenditures, exposing errors in the financial report of the Secretary of the Treasury, was continued until the morning hour expired.

The naval appropriation bill was taken up in Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union, Mr. R. W. Thompson in the chair.

Mr. Vinton said that, after consultation with the Secretary of the Navy, it was ascertained that the estimates submitted last winter could now be reduced a million and a half of dollars.

Mr. Rhett sent to the Clerk resolutions, which were read, maintaining that, under no circumstances, will Congress recognise any proposition which has for its object the institution of slavery in any territory which may be acquired by purchase or conquest, and that in such territory all people have a right to remove with their property, &c.

Mr. Vinton and others called him to order, but The Chairman decided that he should go on. From this an appeal was taken, and, by a vote of 80 to 44, the Chairman was sustained.

Mr. Rhett then spoke in advocacy of the resolutions.

Mr. Venable contended that Congress, under the Constitution, has no right to legislate on the subject of slavery in the Territories.

Mr. Brodhead obtained the floor, and, on his motion, the Committee rose, and the House adjourned.

JUNE 2.

The Presiding Officer laid before the Senate a communication from Professor Bache.

A communication was received from the Secretary of the Treasury, communicating the information called for by a resolution of the Senate, in reference to the light-house being erected on Execution rocks, Long Island sound.

The consideration of the Oregon Territorial Bill was resumed, and Mr. Bright withdrew his motion to strike out the twelfth section. [The section extending to the Territory the provisions of the Ordinance of 1787.] But Mr. Berrien renewed the motion.

Mr. Westcott urged upon Senators to make themselves acquainted with the effect of confirming and continuing in force the laws of the Provisional Government of Oregon. He did not refer to the law on slavery particularly, but to all the laws so enacted. Some of these are onerous, extraordinary, and inconsistent with the laws of the United States. One prohibits the introduction, by sea or land, of any ardent spirits.

Mr. Turney said that, for the first time, they were now to have a sectional vote upon this subject. The proposition to strike out the twelfth section, withdrawn by the Senator from Indiana, had been renewed by a Southern man. A common platform had been established for the North and the South, and that platform was now to be destroyed, and a prohibition introduced, which would compel the South to vote against the bill, unless the obnoxious section was stricken out. If successful, the consequences would be seen in November.

Mr. Badger gave the reasons which would influence him in voting to retain the twelfth section. By repealing the section, all the laws now existing in Oregon would cease to be operative the moment this law is passed, and, as months will elapse before the law can reach them, all action under the laws now in force there, from the time of the passage of this law until it reaches them, would be declared null and void.

Mr. Rusk thought that the Senator from North Carolina had entirely mistaken the effect of striking out the section.

Mr. Butler said that it was a mistake to suppose that this bill comes here with the unanimous sanction, by the committee, of the twelfth section. He had been uncompromisingly opposed to it. Two members of the committee were in conflict with the majority, and in favor of the bill reported last session, from the Judiciary Committee, (Mr. Westcott's substitute for the present bill.)

He was willing that the people of the Territory—as he knew they would—should hereafter establish such laws excluding slavery as they deemed proper. All he or the South desired, in this matter, was that no abstract principle should be introduced with this bill, which might hereafter be quoted against them.

Mr. Badger said, that even according to the view taken of the subject by the Senator from Texas, (Mr. Rusk,) it was a matter of perfect indifference whether the twelfth section was or was not stricken out.

Mr. Rusk replied, and insisted that there was no necessity for taking up and re-enacting a law of the Territory, which expressly declares that slavery shall never exist there.* It was unnecessary, because no one believed that slavery would ever be there introduced.

Mr. Niles was in favor of retaining the twelfth section.

Mr. Calhoun (Mr. Niles giving way) said that the South rested their rights upon the equality of the States—that no discrimination should be made between those who hold slaves and those who do not hold slaves.

Mr. Niles continued. The Constitution is not conversant with the rights of property in the States—the power to regulate persons and property belonged to the States themselves. If what is property in one State is not property in another, it may be excluded.

Mr. Downs earnestly sustained the motion to strike out the twelfth section. He considered the doctrines of the Wilmot Proviso as clearly embodied in that section as they were in the proposition of the gentleman from New Hampshire itself.

Mr. Houston (prefaced by a few explanatory remarks) offered an amendment to the twelfth section, in the shape of a proviso, that the provisions embraced in this section shall only be so far extended to Oregon as they may act incompatible with the provisions of this act, "or in violation of any rights secured by the Constitution to the citizens of the United States, or any of them."

His object, he said, was to have protection extended to Oregon without delay, and the amendments he thought would satisfy both the North and the South.

Mr. Calhoun insisted that the amendment left the matter precisely as it was before, and that the most simple way was to strike out the entire section.

A motion to adjourn was made, and decided in the negative—14 to 29.

Mr. Bright expressed his desire to press the question to a vote before an adjournment, and a similar disposition was manifested on the part of other Senators—but a motion to go into Executive session prevailed, and the Senate soon afterwards, at nearly 5 o'clock, adjourned.

[The galleries and lobbies have been thronged the entire day, and the interest manifested in the debate is intense.]

HOUSE.—A bill "prohibiting the importation of adulterated, deteriorated, and misnamed medicines," was reported by Mr. Edwards, from a select committee, read three times, and passed.

On motion of Mr. Rockwell, of Connecticut, the House, by yeas and nays, 84 to 82, then resolved itself into Committee of the Whole, for the consideration of bills on the private calendar.

A great number of these, some originating in the House, and others which have passed the Senate, were considered, reported to the House, and passed; when, from the difficulties in retaining a quorum of members, the House, at half past two o'clock, adjourned.

JUNE 3.

SENATE.—Mr. Underwood's resolution, offered several days since, providing for the collection and publication of statistics in relation to the prices of produce, labor, manufactures, agriculture, &c., in the several States, was taken up. After debate, by Messrs. Benton in opposition, and Mr. Underwood in favor of the resolution, its further consideration was postponed.

Mr. Breese reported back from the Committee on Public Lands, House bill, without amendment, explanatory of the act appropriating the proceeds of the public lands, and granting pre-emption rights, and the bill was passed.

The consideration of the Oregon Territorial Bill was then resumed, the question being on the motion of Mr. Berrien to strike out the twelfth section of the bill. This section, upon which so much discussion has arisen, is in the words following:

"*And be it further enacted,* That the inhabitants of the said Territory shall be entitled to all the rights, privileges, and immunities, heretofore granted and secured to the Territory of Iowa and its inhabitants; and the existing laws now in force in the Territory of Oregon, under the authority of the Provisional Government established by the people thereof, shall continue to be valid and operative therein, so far as the same may not be incompatible with the provisions of this act; subject, nevertheless, to be altered, modified, or repealed, by the Governor and Legislative Assembly of the said Territory of Oregon; and the laws of the United States are hereby extended over and declared to be in force in said Territory, so far as the same, or any provision thereof, may be applicable."

The amendment yesterday offered by General Houston, if adopted, will come in after the words "provision of this act."

Mr. Foote, this morning, proposed further to amend the section, by inserting after the words "Iowa and to its inhabitants," in the first sentence, the words, "so far as the same may be compatible with the Constitution of the United States."

Mr. Westcott insisted that the amendment would not change the character of the section, and Mr. Foote replied.

Mr. Underwood then addressed the Senate at length, chiefly in reply to Mr. Niles's remarks of yesterday. All that the South desired, if he understood their views, was, that the people of the Territories should have the right to adopt such laws as they deem proper. Let not the North attempt to prescribe any particular system of laws—not say to them, you shall not have slavery, but leave them to decide for themselves. In this very bill, all legislative powers are granted to the people of Oregon. Then, all that is proper further to be done is simply to extend the Constitution of the United States over them, and leave the Supreme Court to decide what laws are and what laws are not constitutional. He was in favor of striking from the bill everything relating to slavery.

Mr. Baldwin thought there was nothing in this bill, in his opinion, which called upon any Senator to stand forth as the peculiar representative of one section of the Union or another. It was simply proposed by this section to give validity to the laws passed by the Provisional Legislature of Oregon. If the twelfth section were stricken out, he did not think that the fifteenth section (as yesterday contended by the Senator from Texas, Mr. Rusk) would give to the laws of the Provisional Government the validity required, to make them recognisable by the judicial tribunals of the country.

Mr. Rusk reiterated, that, without this section, the laws of the Provisional Government would remain in force until repealed, and, further, that the fifteenth section recognises the validity of all these laws. Therefore the twelfth section was unnecessary, while its adoption would be a re-enactment of the principle of the Wilmot Proviso.

Mr. Baldwin further contended, that a vessel leaving South Carolina, Virginia, Maryland, or any other slave State, with slaves on board, carried with it, not the laws of the particular State from which she sailed, but the laws of the United States—that the slave laws are purely local, and, if a slaveholder brings his slave into a free State, the moment that slave touches such free soil, his shackles fall off, even though brought there for a mere temporary purpose.

The further consideration of the bill, at the close of Mr. Baldwin's speech, was postponed to Monday next, and a substitute offered by Mr. Badger for Mr. Foote's amendment, viz: "But shall not be subject to the conditions contained in the article of compact of the Ordinance of 1787," was ordered to be printed.

On motion, it was resolved, that when the Senate adjourn on Monday, it adjourn to the following Thursday.

The flag, from the Halls of the Montezumas, presented through General Twiggs, was ordered to be deposited in the Department of State.

Executive session. Adjourned.

HOUSE.—The House, to-day, in Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union, took up the bill making appropriations for the Navy Department, when

Mr. Brodhead delivered a speech on the subject of slavery in the Territories. He took the ground of neutrality, that Congress cannot interfere with that institution, and in favor of the Missouri Compromise.

Mr. Brown, of Mississippi, contended that, under the Constitution, none of the people of the States can be prevented from removing to the Territories with their slave property.

Mr. Sawyer called the attention of the country to the fact that there were five hundred bills on the calendar not acted upon. He was desirous that this bill should be passed, to give the Whigs an opportunity of attending the Philadelphia Convention; and on his motion the Committee rose.

He offered a resolution that the debate be terminated in ten minutes. This was disagreed to. The House again went into Committee, when

Mr. Stanton offered an amendment, appropriating $5,000 to send an expedition to South America, to take observations on the transit of the planet Venus. He explained the object fully.

Mr. Evans, of Maryland, delivered his views, showing an extensive acquaintance with astronomy.

Mr. Cathcart, in a few humorous remarks, ridiculed the object.

Mr Holmes, of South Carolina, supported the amendment, which was finally agreed to.

And after the transaction of some other business of a trifling nature, an adjournment took place.

JUNE 5.

SENATE.—Mr. Baldwin, at present holding a seat under appointment of the Governor of Connecticut, to fill a vacancy, having been elected by the Legislature of that State to serve out the Congress, qualified accordingly.

Among the petitions presented, was one by Mr. Clarke, from Rhode Island, praying the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia; which was laid on the table.

Mr. Davis, of Massachusetts, desired to get up a bill relating to a treaty with China, for the protection of American citizens. Some objection was urged, in consequence of the absence of several Senators, and the motion was lost—ayes 15, to 17 nays.

A resolution was offered by Mr. Badger, ordering the printing of 20,000 extra copies of the Patent Office report, for the use of the Senate; but, without taking the question, (several Senators being absent,) the Senate adjourned over till Thursday next.

HOUSE.—Mr. McClelland introduced William P. Lynd, one of the two delegates from the recently admitted new State of Wisconsin. He took the oath to support the Constitution of the United States.

On motion of Mr. Holmes, of South Carolina, it was resolved, that when the House adjourn today, it be until Friday next. [The object is to enable the Whigs to attend the Philadelphia Convention on Wednesday.]

The House took up the motion of Mr. Cummins to reconsider the vote by which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary the bill introduced by him on Thursday, to protect naturalized citizens in their rights from the interference of foreign Governments, through their agents. [It was brought forward with reference to the interference of Mr. Bodisco with the business of Major Tochman, who is the authorized attorney for the heirs of Kosciusko.]

The vote was previously reconsidered by 78 to 66; and on the question recurring to refer the bill to the Judiciary Committee, it was decided in the affirmative—yeas 76, nays 64.

The House resolved itself into Committee, and took up the naval appropriation bill, when

Mr. Kaufman made a speech to prove that the Rio Grande was the boundary of Texas.

Mr. Pettit obtained the floor, and, on his motion, the Committee rose, and the House adjourned until Friday.

FOREIGN MARKETS.

LIVERPOOL.

Corn Market.—Best Western Canal flour, 27*s.* 6*d.* a 28*s.* per barrel; Richmond and Alexandria, 27*s.* a 27*s.* 6*d.*; Philadelphia and Baltimore, 27*s.* a 27*s.* 6*d.*; New Orleans and Ohio, 26*s.* a 27*s.*; Canadian, 27*s.* a 28*s.*; United States and Canadian, sour, 24*s.* 6*d.* a 25*s.* 6*d.* Wheat, United States and Canadian, per 70 pounds—white and mixed, 7*s.* a 8*s.* 3*d.*; red, 6*s.* 5*d.* a 7*s.* 4*d.* Indian corn, per quarter, 30*s.* a 32*s.* 6*d.* Indian meal, per barrel, 12*s.* 6*d.* a 14*s.* Barley, per 60 pounds, 3*s.* a 3*s.* 8*d.* Oats, per 45 pounds, 2*s.* a 2*s.* 3*d.* Oat meal, per 240 pounds, 22*s.* a 23*s.* Rye, per 60 pounds, 3*s.* a 3*s.* 8*d.* Peas, per 504 pounds, 28*s.* a 32*s.*, quoted duty paid.

Beef.—Prime mess, per tierce, new, 85*s.* a 92*s.* 6*d.*; ordinary, 76*s.* a 83*s.*; old, 60*s.* a 68*s.*; mess, per barrel, new, 50*s.* a 54*s.*; ordinary and old, 36*s.* a 46*s.*; prime, 30*s.* a 36*s.*; extra India, family, &c., per tierce, 97*s.* a 105*s.*

Pork.—Prime mess, new, per barrel, 55*s.* a 70*s.*; old, 44*s.* a 56*s.*; mess, 44*s.* a 60*s.*; prime, 35*s.* a 45*s.*

Bacon.—Dried and smoked, old, per cwt, 16*s.* a 30*s.*; long and short middles, free from bone, in salt—Eastern, 50*s.* a 54*s.*, Western, 36*s.* a 52*s.* 3*d.*; shoulders, 20*s.* a 28*s.*

Lard.—Fine leaf, in kegs, per cwt., 42*s.* a 45*s.*; do., in barrels, 39*s.* a 43*s.* 6*d.*; ordinary to middling, 36*s.* 6*d.* a 38*s.*; inferior and grease, 30*s.* a 35*s.*

The above are duty free.

Cheese.—Fine, duty paid, per cwt, 48*s.* a 52*s.*; middling, 43*s.* a 46*s.*; ordinary, 36*s.* a 42*s.*

Butter.—United States and Canada, not quoted; grease, 44*s.* a 45*s.*

Hams.—Smoked or dry in the canvas, per cwt., duty paid, 20*s.* a 50*s.*; in casks in salt, not smoked, duty free, 25*s.* a 45*s.* Tongues, ox, in pickle, duty paid, per dozen., 12*s.* a 20*s.*; pigs, per cwt, 20*s.* a 35*s.*

DOMESTIC MARKETS.

BALTIMORE.

Beef Cattle.—Sales small at $3.18 a $4 per 100 pounds, on the hoof, equal to $6.36 a $7.75 nett, and averaging about $3 50 gross.

Hogs.—Sales at $4 a $4.50.

Flour and Meal.—The recent European news has produced no effect. Howard Street brands at $5.62½. The supply of City Mills is light, at $5.75—some ask $5.87. Rye flour, $3.75 a $3.87. Corn meal dull at $2.37 per barrel.

Grain.—Receipts moderate. Good to prime red wheat at $1.17 a $1.23; white $1.23 a $1.35. Corn firm—white at 44 a 45 cents, and yellow at 46 a 47 cents. Oats at 30 a 33 cents. Rye 70 a 75 cents per bushel.

Provisions.—Transactions moderate. Mess pork, $9.62 a $10; prime, $7.25. Mess beef, $10 a $10.25; prime, $7.50. Sides in salt, at 4¼ a 4½ cents. Bacon—shoulders, 3¾ a 4 cents; hams, 4 a 6½ cents. Lard, 6¾ a 7½ cents per pound, in barrels and kegs.

OFFICE OF CONSULTING ENGINEERS AND COUNSELLERS FOR PATENTEES:

FOR imparting information on the subject of Inventions, and on the application of Chemical and Mechanical Science to the Arts, Agriculture, Manufactures, and Mines, and for procuring and defending Patents, either in the United States or in foreign countries.

Professor WALTER R. JOHNSON, late of Philadelphia, and Z. C. ROBBINS, of Washington City, (aided by HAZARD KNOWLES, Esq., late Machinist of the United States Patent Office,) have associated themselves together for the prosecution of the above branches of professional business, either in their office, at the Patent Office, or before the courts; and will devote their undivided attention to forwarding the interests of Inventors or others who may consult them or place business in their hands.

Mr. Knowles has for the past twelve years held the post of Machinist in the United States Patent Office, and resigns that situation to take part in the present undertaking. His talents and peculiar fitness for the important office so long filled by him, have been fully recognised by Inventors wherever the office is itself known.

The office of Messrs. J. & R. is on F street, opposite the Patent Office, Washington, D. C., where communications, *post paid*, will be promptly attended to; examinations made, drawings, specifications, and all requisite papers prepared—and models procured when desired—on reasonable terms. Letters of inquiry, expected to be answered after examinations had, must be accompanied by a fee of five dollars.

In the duties of their office which pertain to the Patent Laws, Messrs. J. & R. will be assisted by a legal gentleman of the highest professional character, and fully conversant with Mechanics and other scientific subjects.

Washington, D. C., June 1, 1848. 3m*

GLASCOE, HENRY, & WEBB,

COTTON and Tobacco Factors; Dealers in Blooms, Pig Iron, Pig Lead, Bagging and Rope, &c.; Commission and Forwarding—Columbia street, next to Broadway Hotel, Cincinnati, Ohio.

J. S. GLASCOE.
C. B. HENRY.
June 8.—1y E. WEBB.

LARD FOR OIL.

LARD WANTED.—Cash paid for corn, mast, and slop-fed Lard. Apply to

THOMAS EMERY, Lard Oil Manufacturer,
Jan. 20. 33 Water street, near Walnut, Cincinnati, O.

LAW OFFICE, COLUMBUS, O.

WILLIAM B. JARVIS, Jun., *Attorney and Counsellor at Law,* Columbus, Ohio. Office up stairs in Heran-court's Building, between American Hotel and Nail House. Business connected with the profession, of all kinds, punctually attended to. Jan. 28.

GODEY'S

LADY'S BOOK AND FAMILY MAGAZINE.—The oldest Magazine in the United States; contains monthly sixty pages of reading matter, by the first writers in the country, twelve more than the New York magazines. Two splendid steel engravings, an undeniable authentic colored monthly fashion plate, model cottages and churches, crotchet work and other matters for the ladies, all illustrated and well explained, &c.

Price for one year, which includes the Lady's Dollar Newspaper, making three publications in one month, $3; two copies without the Lady's Dollar Newspaper, $5; five copies, with one to the person sending the club, $10; eight copies, $15; twelve copies, $20.

A specimen of either the Lady's Book or the Lady's Dollar Newspaper sent to any person paying postage on the request. Address L. A. GODEY,

Feb. 3. No. 113 Chesnut street, Philadelphia.

JUDGE JAY'S LETTER TO BISHOP IVES.

A LETTER to the Right Rev. L. Silliman Ives, Bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the State of North Carolina: occasioned by his late Address to the Convention of his Diocese. By WILLIAM JAY. Third edition.

The numerous readers of this most excellent and interesting letter, published in the National Era in 1847, will be pleased to know that it has been handsomely stereotyped, under the direction of the Executive Committee of the American and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, and is now for sale at $2.40 per hundred, or three cents single.

Orders, accompanied by the cash, and directing by what conveyance they may be forwarded, will be promptly executed by WILLIAM HARNED,

April 13. 61 John Street, New York.

ENGRAVING.

J. HALL, *Designer and Engraver, No. 8 Eutaw street, opposite the Eutaw House, Baltimore.*—Drawings of Buildings, Machinery, Specifications for the Patent Office, &c. Seals, Steel Letters, and all kinds of Wood and Copperplate Engraving, executed at the shortest notice. Patterns for Castings made. Brands and Stencils cut to order.

Drawing School.—Instruction given in the art of Drawing. April 22.

NO FELLOWSHIP WITH SLAVEHOLDERS.

A SCRIPTURAL ARGUMENT in favor of withdrawing fellowship from Churches and Ecclesiastical Bodies tolerating Slaveholding among them, by Rev. Silas McKeen, of Bradford, Vermont, is the title of a tract of 40 pages, just published by the American and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, and for sale at their Depository in New York. Price—$2.50 a hundred; single copy, 3 cents.

WILLIAM HARNED, Agent,
April 20. 61 John street, New York.

JUST PUBLISHED.

BY the American and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, Letters respecting a book "Dropped from the Catalogue" of the American Sunday School Union, in compliance with the Dictation of the Slave Power—a neat pamphlet of 36 pages, and for sale at the Depository, New York, at $3 per 100. Also, a few copies of "Jacob and his Sons," the book referred to above. Price 25 cents. WM. HARNED, Agent,

May 18. 61 John street.

THE CHEAPEST ANTI-SLAVERY TRACT YET PUBLISHED.

THE ADDRESS OF THE SOUTHERN AND WESTERN LIBERTY CONVENTION, held at Cincinnati, June 11th and 12th, 1845, to the People of the United States: with notes, by a citizen of Pennsylvania. A pamphlet, containing 16 closely printed octavo pages of facts and statistics, showing the effects of Southern Slavery on the interests of this country; on fine paper and handsome type, and sold at the exceedingly low rate of ten dollars per thousand, or one dollar per hundred!

Orders, post paid, enclosing the money, and addressed to the subscriber, will be promptly executed; the order should state distinctly by what mode of conveyance they are to be sent. WILLIAM HARNED,

March 30. 61 John street, New York.

WEBSTER'S DICTIONARY.

THE ENTIRE WORK, UNABRIDGED—in one volume, crown quarto—containing all the matter of Dr. Webster's original work, his improvements up to the time of his death, and now thoroughly revised and greatly enlarged and improved by

PROF. C. A. GOODRICH, *of Yale College.*

☞ Price reduced to $6. ☜

This edition contains *three times* the amount of matter found in any other English Dictionary compiled in this country, or any abridgement of this work, yet it is sold at a trifling advance above the price of other and limited works.

"The definitions are models of condensation and purity."
Hon. William B. Calhoun.

TESTIMONIALS.

From the London Literary Gazette, April 1, 1848.

In the present edition, Professor Goodrich has been ably assisted by several eminent men, each distinguished in his own sphere of inquiry, and the result is in the highest degree satisfactory. The work is a noble monument of erudition and indefatigable research, and, the style and accuracy of its typography would do honor to the press of any country in Europe. This volume must find its way into all our public and good private libraries, for it provides the English student with a mass of the most valuable information, which he would in vain seek for elsewhere.

The new edition of Webster's Dictionary, in crown quarto, seems to us deserving of general patronage.

We recommend it to all who desire to possess *the most complete, accurate, and reliable dictionary of the language.*

Signed by the following gentlemen, March, 1848.

Theodore Frelinghuysen, Chancellor of the University of New York.
William H. Campbell, Editor of the New York District School Journal.
Daniel Webster, United States Senator.
Thomas H. Benton, do. do.
John Davis, do. do.
Jefferson Davis, do. do.
S. A. Douglas, do. do.
George N. Briggs, Governor of Massachusetts.
William B. Calhoun, Secretary of State of Massachusetts.
Richard S. Rust, Commissioner of Common Schools in New Hampshire.
Theodore F. King, Superintendent of Schools in New Jersey.
Robert C. Winthrop, Speaker of the United States House of Representatives.
Edmund Burke, Commissioner of Patents.
John Young, Governor of New York.
Christopher Morgan, Secretary of State and Superintendent of Common Schools in New York.
Alvah Hunt, Treasurer of New York.
Millard Fillmore, Comptroller.
Rev. Samuel H. Cox, D. D.
Lyman Beecher, D. D., President of Lane Seminary.
Calvin E. Stowe, D. D., and D. H. Allen, Professors in Lane Seminary.
Rev. Heman Humphrey, D. D., late President of Amherst College.
Rev. Ezra Keller, D. D., President of Wittenberg College, Ohio.
M. A. Diehl and N. A. Geiger, Professors in Wittenberg College, Ohio.
Benjamin Larabee, D. D., President of Middlebury College, and other distinguished gentlemen.

The previous edition of Webster's Quarto Dictionary received the following recommendation, from Daniel Webster, Levi Woodbury, Theodore Frelinghuysen, and 101 other members of Congress:

"It is very desirable that one standard dictionary should be used by the numerous millions of people who are to inhabit the vast extent of territory belonging to the United States, as the use of such a standard may prevent the formation of dialects in States remote from each other, and impress upon the language uniformity and stability. It is desirable, also, that the acquisition of the language should be rendered easy, not only to our own citizens, but to foreigners who wish to gain access to the rich stores of science which it contains. We rejoice that the American Dictionary bids fair to become such a standard."

Published by G. & C. MERRIAM, Springfield, Massachusetts, and for sale for them by

FRANCK TAYLOR, Washington City,
And by Booksellers generally throughout the United States.
May 22.—3t

THE NATIONAL ERA.

CONGRESSIONAL.

SPEECH OF MR. GIDDINGS, OF OHIO,

In the House of Representatives, May 13, 1848, on the bill to pay the executrix of Benjamin Hodges, deceased, for a slave who left his master in Prince George's county, in August, 1814, and was supposed to have escaped on board the British fleet.

Mr. GIDDINGS remarked, that the recommitment of the bill, in order to obtain a report of the facts involved, as proposed by the gentleman from Vermont, [Mr. Collamer,] would be equivalent to a rejection of it. No, (said he,) we must take the case without proof, or we must reject it. There is not a scintilla of legal evidence in the case.

Mr. CHAPMAN desired to explain, (Mr. Giddings yielding the floor,) and said he would refer the committee to the affidavits on file. there were three of them.

Mr. GIDDINGS resumed. He said he would assure the gentleman from Maryland that he had carefully examined those affidavits. Not one of the witnesses attempted to speak to any fact within his knowledge. They each referred to what they had heard other persons say, who know no more in relation to the matter than the witnesses themselves. I repeat, (said he,) we have no proof to a single fact involved. If we legislate on the subject, we must do so in utter ignorance of all the circumstances attending it. Yet I do not regard that as a matter of much importance, when compared with the principles involved. Before I enter upon an examination of the case, however, I wish to say that the charge which Southern members have raised, that Northern gentlemen have introduced the subject of slavery into this debate, was not unexpected to me. It is in strict keeping with their usual practice. What are the facts? A slaveholder introduces a bill appropriating the money of the nation to pay for human flesh. My friend from New Hampshire objects to its passage, for the reason that he is unwilling to have the burdens of that institution thrown upon the people of the free States, and straightway five Southern members follow him in debate, each charging him with introducing the exciting subject of slavery into the discussion. Do gentlemen suppose they can thus mislead the public? Do they believe that we shall sit here, with silent tongues and sealed lips, and suffer such bills as this to pass this body? I assure them, most respectfully, that we shall oppose all attempts to involve our people in the expense, the guilt, or disgrace of slavery. No Northern man has ever, to my knowledge, introduced that question here, except for the purpose of separating the people of the free States from its support. No, sir; if any Southern man can point to an instance in which members from the North have brought the question of slavery into this hall, except to defend our people from the encroachments of that institution, let them now rise and sustain their charges with proof. [Mr. G. paused a moment, and then resumed.] Mr. Speaker, where are those gentlemen who made these charges? Why, sir, "they now roar you gently as sucking doves."

I now proceed to examine the case before us. I repeat, that the claim is entirely unsupported by proof. But the petitioner states that she is the widow of Benjamin Hodges, late of Maryland; that he owned a slave who, in 1814, was taken away in August of that year by the British army, on their return from this city to the Chesapeake bay. Now, sir, this statement of the case gives the petitioner no claim upon this Government, unless we have become holden by some act of ours. This seems well understood by the petitioner, and by the committee who reported the bill. They therefore refer to our treaty of peace with Great Britain, signed at Ghent on the 24th December, 1814; the first article of which provides, "that each party shall evacuate all territory, places, and possessions, taken during the war," "without destruction, or carrying away any of the artillery or other public property originally captured in said forts or places, and which shall remain therein upon the exchange of ratifications of this treaty, *or any slaves or other private property.*"

Our Government claimed, under this treaty, that England should pay our slaveholders for all slaves taken from our shores by the British fleet *when they left our coast.* England refused, and the subject was referred to the Emperor of Russia. He decided that the British Government was bound to pay for slaves thus carried away when they left our shores, after the signing of the treaty. This led to the treaty of St. Petersburg, dated the 17th June, 1822, by the first article of which provision is made for establishing a board, consisting of two commissioners and two arbitrators, to determine the claims presented by the people of this Government. This board were constituted the joint agents of both Governments. His Britannic Majesty appointed one commissioner and one arbitrator; and the President of the United States, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, appointed the other commissioner and arbitrator. England never trusted this fund to Congress for distribution; that was to be done by the joint commission. The second article provided for the ascertaining of the average value of slaves.

The third article reads as follows:

"When the average value of slaves shall have been ascertained and fixed, the two commissioners shall constitute a board for the examination of the claims which are to be submitted to them; and they shall notify the Secretary of State of the United States that they are ready to receive a definite list of the slaves, and other private property for which the citizens of the United States claim indemnification; *it being understood and hereby agreed that the commission shall not take cognizance of, nor receive, and that his Britannic Majesty shall not be required to make payment for any claim for private property not contained in said list.*"

There is no pretence that the slave in question was named in said list. The report of the committee admits that he was not. [Calls from various parts of the hall were made for the reading of this article again. Mr. G. again read it, and proceeded.] This, sir, was our distinct compact with Great Britain. We solemnly stipulated that no claims should be made on that Government, nor should she be required to make compensation for claims *other than those contained in the list furnished by our Secretary of State.* To-day we are called on to appropriate this money to the payment of other claims. We are asked to violate this solemn treaty, to disregard the pledged faith of the nation, in order to give this slaveholder the value of the body, of the bones and muscles, the blood and sinews, of his fellow-man.

But, sir, in order that no room for cavil should be left, the fifth article provided that "the decision of the two commissioners, or a majority of the board, shall in all cases be *conclusive as to number, value, or the ownership of slaves, or other property for which indemnity is to be made.*" They were not only to confine themselves to the list furnished them by our Secretary of State, but their decision upon the claims mentioned on said list was to be entirely conclusive upon the parties.

Under this treaty, the members of this board were appointed, met in this city, organized, took the oath of office, and called on the Secretary of State for the list mentioned. It was furnished; but there was no claim for this slave upon it. They proceeded to examine and adjudicate upon claims presented on said list. When they had completed their labors, they found the amount of all claims allowed *on said list* to be "*twelve hundred and four thousand nine hundred and sixty dollars.*" This was the precise amount of claims *allowed* by the board, who acted as the agents of Great Britain and of the United States. And on the 13th of November, 1826, at London, another convention was entered into, by the first article of which it was provided that his Britannic Majesty should pay to this Government the sum just mentioned, "*for the use of persons entitled to indemnification and compensation by virtue of said decision.*" Sir, to divert this money, or any portion of it, to the payment of other claims, would be a violation of the trust reposed in this Government, a breach of this solemn covenant, and a total disregard of our pledged faith. If there be one cent more than to meet those claims, there has been a mistake or fraud on our part. In 1842, as chairman of the Committee of Claims, I held a correspondence with the Department on this subject, and was then informed that about four thousand dollars of this fund had not then been paid out to those to whom it was due. I now understand there are about two thousand dollars still remaining undistributed. But it belongs to the persons to whom it was awarded, as much as though it were bank stock; and when they or their heirs call for it at the Treasury, they must receive it, whether the demand be made this year or a century hence. The bill, therefore, is nothing more nor less than a proposition to pay for the slave from the public treasury.

The committee who reported this bill admit that the claim does not come within the provisions of the treaty; yet they say the petitioner lost the slave, and they propose to pay for his loss. Sir, shall we pay for all slaves that have been lost? Any other man who has had a slave run away has an equal claim with this petitioner. The owner of any one of the twenty thousand fugitives now in Canada has as much claim upon the national treasure for compensation as the petitioner. If we pay this claim, the money must come from the pockets of the People. The people of the free States must pay at least three-fourths of it. If we pay this, shall we pay for all fugitive slaves? There are probably thirty or perhaps forty thousand masters who will present claims on us for their locomotive property, each of which is as meritorious as the one under consideration.

Mr. Chairman, at the very moment we are thus called on to legislate for the support of slavery in Maryland and in the other slave States, we are told that we have no power whatever over that institution; that it is so far beyond our control that we must not even discuss its merits. Now, sir, I desire that Southern gentlemen shall take some position, and that they shall remain in it at least during this session of Congress. If we have jurisdiction of slavery in the States, let Southern men admit the fact, and let us at once abolish it from our Union, and wipe out the foul blot that has so long disgraced our national character. If we have not jurisdiction of it, why are we called on to legislate for its support? If it be a State institution, why is it constantly dragged into the discussions of this hall? Why are we called on to take jurisdiction of it? Why are its burdens sought to be cast upon the people of the free States? Why are we to participate in its crimes? A year or two since, we were not permitted to speak our views in regard to slavery, for the reason, as Southern gentlemen then said, that we had no power over it; to-day, they ask us to legislate for its benefit. Yes, sir; it is an established fact, and history will record it, that we are now legislating upon the rights of a master to his slave in Maryland—not at the instance of Northern members—no; the bill was reported by a gentleman from South Carolina, [Mr. Rhett,] and we Northern men sit here with all becoming gravity, and solemnly enter into an investigation of this man's right to the body of his fellow-man in that State. I repeat, sir, we have jurisdiction of this subject, or we have not. I am willing to leave the selection of either horn of this dilemma to Southern men. They may take their choice; but let them choose one or the other. Let us know where to find them. I have at all times denied that we have any constitutional powers in relation to this institution. But if we have the constitutional right to legislate on the subject, and to appropriate the treasure of the nation in the manner proposed, then, sir, let us change the form of the bill before us, and give the two hundred and eighty dollars which it appropriates to the slave instead of the master. That proposition would be much more consonant to my feelings, and is equally within our power, and much nearer our duty. I would go further, and would grant fifty or a hundred dollars to each slave who shall escape from his master, as a bounty for his energy, and to begin the world with. But Southern men will start back with horror at this proposition. Yet, sir, if we are to appropriate the money of our people on this subject, I insist that the appropriation shall be for the promotion of freedom, and not of slavery. I repeat, that I am willing Southern members should choose either position. They may give us jurisdiction of slavery, or they may retain it in their several States. But if they place it in our hands, then I propose at once to abolish it, to strike it from existence. But, sir, I tell Southern gentlemen that we will not take jurisdiction of it to-day, and deny that we have any power over it to-morrow. We will not face to the right, to the left, and to the right-about, at the bidding of the slave power.

Sir, I insist that we have no constitutional power to sit here and appropriate our time to the investigation of this matter of slavery. It is an indignity to the people of our free States. They sent us here for no such object. I say to gentlemen of the South, "*Take care of your slavery in your own way; we will have nothing to do with it.* Its blessings and its curses, its evils and its benefits, its vices, its crimes, its guilt, and its disgrace, are *yours.* Keep them to yourselves. We will not contaminate our moral or our political purity by any participation in them."

Even during this present discussion, gentlemen have complained that we Northern men are striving to extend our power over slavery. This is their perpetual cry on all occasions. Why, sir, from the time I first took my seat in this hall to the present day, I have opposed all attempts to connect slavery with this Government. I repeat what I said a few days since, that as early as 1842 I was driven from my seat in this body for presenting resolutions denying the power of the Federal Government to involve the free States in the support of the coastwise slave trade.

Mr. HOLMES, of South Carolina, interrupted Mr. Giddings, who yielded him the floor. He then stated that Mr. Giddings was not censured for presenting such resolutions, but for presenting a petition for dissolving the Union, and surreptitiously sending it to a committee of this House.

Mr. GIDDINGS resumed. Sir, it is a most lamentable fact, that whenever we speak upon this subject, slaveholders in this House become, for the time being, actually demented. Now, there is not the least doubt that some phantom is haunting the disordered imagination of the gentleman, [Mr. Holmes,] to the effect which he has named. Sir, my resolutions are upon record, and will bear to those who shall follow us the sentiments I have expressed here to-day.

Mr. HOLMES (interrupting Mr. Giddings) repeated what he had previously said.

Mr. GIDDINGS resumed. The gentleman is entirely mistaken; his assertion is false, though surely not so intended.

Mr. GAYLE called Mr. Giddings to order.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Sims, of South Carolina) decided that Mr. Giddings had violated no rule of the House.

Mr. GIDDINGS resumed. Sir, I well know the gentleman from South Carolina is incapable of asserting an intentional falsehood. And his persisting in the assertion is conclusive proof of his dementation.* I repeat, that in no instance, from my advent into this Hall down to the present day, have I ceased to oppose all interference with slavery. I have endeavored, to the extent of my humble powers, to separate this Government and the people of the free States from all connection with it. I shall continue those efforts, and thousands and tens of thousands of others are exerting their moral and political influence to effect that object, and we shall not cease our exertions until, by God's blessing, we shall redeem ourselves and the Government from all support of that institution.

But, sir, I will express my thanks to the gentleman from South Carolina for bringing this subject before us in its present form. It is now under consideration, and must be disposed of; and I most devoutly thank my God that he has permitted me to see a time when Northern men *must act;* when there is no way of evading this question; when the doughfaces of this body will be constrained to vote on this identical question; and that such action will be public, and their votes placed on record, so that their constituents and the country may know and bear witness to the manner in which they meet the question before us. Will they vote to tax their constituents, at the dictation of Southern members, to pay for a fugitive slave who ran away from Maryland thirty years ago? They must do it, or they must refuse to do it. They must now serve God or Mammon. They can no longer act both ways. The subject will soon be decided by the monosyllable *yes* or *no,* to be pronounced by each member.

It has been said that we desire to keep this money in the Treasury. I, sir, have no such wish. God forbid! It is the price of blood. It was obtained from Great Britain by the Executive without consulting this body. The treaties and conventions were negotiated, and the money obtained by the treaty-making power, with which we have no right to interfere. The President and Senate undertook to act as the agent and attorney of those slaveholders. They obtained the money from Great Britain; they have paid out all but two thousand dollars; let them dispose of that as they please. If the gentleman who reported this bill will modify it, so as to let the President dispose of the remainder to whom and as he pleases, I will vote for it. He is a slaveholder; he understands this dealing in human flesh; I do not. Let him have the money, and let him pay it out. *I will have nothing to do with such business.*

I differ from my honorable friend from Vermont, who gave us such a lucid exposé of the treaty and its stipulations. I understood him to say, that if the Committee would take the case again into consideration, and show such facts as will bring this slave within the provisions of our treaty with Great Britain, he will vote to pay for him. Sir, I will do no such thing. I will not, in my capacity as a legislator, acting as the representative of freemen, degrade myself, while sitting in this hall, by an inquiry into the price and value of our common humanity. I will not disgrace my constituents, while acting under their high commission, by entering upon an inquiry as to the title-deeds by which one man holds another as property. I will not sit here to inquire as to the value, in dollars and cents, of human bones and muscles, blood and sinews. No, sir; the history of our legislation shall not bear to coming generations the fact, that the twentieth Congressional district of Ohio, at this age of the world, with the light and knowledge which now beams upon us, was disgraced by its representative in this hall entering upon such an inquiry. My constituents do not estimate man, the child of immortality, created in the image of his God, with his exalted nature, his undying intellect, by the value of sordid dust.

I wish to address some inquiries to the honorable chairman of the Committee who reported this bill, [Mr. Smith, of Connecticut.] He appears to have united in this extraordinary report, which estimates the value of this man at precisely *two hundred and eighty dollars.* That gentleman is from Connecticut—from the very county in which my parents long resided. I should like to inquire of him the price current of humanity in that land of steady habits. By what rule does he arrive at the value of men? Is he governed by the brilliancy of their virtues? By their intellectual endowments? Does he estimate men by their religious devotion, or by their learning? Is he guided by their complexion? If so, which is the most valuable, black or white? Or is a mixture of blood to be preferred? What price, in gold and silver, does he place upon his constituents? How would he sell them? Sir, I feel humbled when I see Northern Representatives consent to enter upon this slave-dealing legislation, and become the instruments of the slave power, to strike down the honor, the dignity, and independence of the Northern States. I appeal to Northern Democrats and Northern Whigs. By what rule are you governed when you decide upon the value of your brother man? When inquired of by your constituents as to your estimate, will you say that he was valuable on account of his political principles? That he was a supporter of Mr. Polk, or of Mr. Clay? And when they ask you if you believe that "self-evident truth, that *all men are born equal,*" what will be your answer? Will you, like honest men, admit that you have contributed your vote to take the money from their pockets to pay for Southern slaves? If you do, I apprehend they will tell you, hereafter, to deal on your own account, while trading in human flesh, and not to use their funds for such purpose.

* Mr. Holmes sent for the Journal of the House containing the proceedings of Mr. Giddings's censure, and, having examined it, said no more on the subject.

But this bill is based upon the principle, that under our Federal Constitution man may hold his fellow-man as property. I speak not of the slave States, but of the Federal Government. I deny that we possess the power, under the Constitution, to imbrute our fellow-men and render them *property*—that we have power to disrobe man of the dignity in which he was created, tear from him the rights which God has given him, and deliver him over to the arbitrary will of his brother man, to toil at another's bidding, cringe beneath his owner's lash, tremble at his frown, and be sold at his will. Such powers have not been granted us by the people of this nation. Such doctrines cannot find support in this hall at the present age of the world.

Mr. HOLMES, of South Carolina, interrupting Mr. Giddings, said that the Southern States would hold their slaves as *property,* in spite of any act of the Federal Government, or the efforts of Northern Abolitionists.

Mr. GIDDINGS. I have nothing to do with the Southern States; they control their own policy; their barbarism has no relation to my duties as a member of Congress. If they see fit to make one-half of their people the property of the other half, we cannot interfere with their laws. If, with the inhabitants of the Fejee islands, they become cannibals, and eat each other, we have not the power to prohibit such revolting practice by our legislation. All we can do is, to see that they shall not disgrace nor degrade this Government, nor the people of the free States, either by their slavery or their cannibalism. Our motto is, "Keep your slavery, your disgusting barbarity, within your own States! Bring it not into this hall, nor attempt to involve us in its burdens or its crimes." I repeat, that we are not now acting under the constitutions of either of the slave or of the free States, but under our *Federal* compact. The formation of that instrument was preceded by a long and ardent struggle for freedom, for the rights of humanity.

In looking back to the darker and more barbarous ages, when war was regarded as the only honorable employment of mankind, we find that slavery existed; and the prisoner captured in war, and held as a slave by his captor, was considered as *property.* At that period, when moral darkness enshrouded the minds of men, and shut out from them an understanding of their natural rights, the opinion that slaves were property was general, and no one doubted its correctness. I say *no one.* I mean none but the learned. I except the philosophers; for Aristotle, in his day, with a mind enlightened by study and reflection, although he lived in a barbarous age, long prior to the Christian era, denied the doctrine so zealously maintained in this hall to-day by Southern gentlemen. The Immaculate Nazarene declared that one object of his divine mission was, "*to proclaim liberty to the captive.*" He, too, combated this doctrine of oppression, which, through ages and centuries of intellectual darkness, robbed a portion of our race of their inalienable rights, and which is now advocated in this body with more zeal than it was among the Jews eighteen hundred years since. Even at a comparatively recent period, some learned and intelligent men held to this doctrine, now so abhorrent to every friend of freedom. As late as 1749, Lord Hardwicke, of England, held that trover lay in the English courts for a slave brought from the West Indies into England. When, in 1766, Granville Sharpe published his first essays, denying this doctrine, it was looked upon as ultraism, as opposed to the doctrine of English law, to the principles expressed by Lord Hardwicke, and Sharpe was regarded as a fanatic. At that time, no lawyer dared to rise in a British court and deny that man could hold property in man on British soil. When, in 1769, Sommersett was brought up before Lord Mansfield on a *habeas corpus,* and the sole claim for his freedom was the great fundamental truth, that God had created him free, and that no positive statute existed in England by which he could be deprived of that liberty which God had given him, his lordship saw the force of this heaven-born truth; his brilliant mind comprehended its bearing, and the effect it must have on mankind. Still he hesitated, remanded Sommersett, and endeavored to avoid a direct decision of the point by advising the parties to compromise the matter. For more than two years he refused to declare the opinion of the court. At length he gave judgment in favor of the natural and inherent right of man to the enjoyment of his liberty. Speaking of slavery, he said, "*it is so odious that nothing but positive law can be suffered to support it.*"

On the 4th of July, 1776, our fathers assembled in solemn convocation, denied the doctrine so strenuously advocated here to-day, and with unanimous voice proclaimed it a "*self-evident truth*" that "*all men are born equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights; that among those rights are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.*"

Sir, no evasion, no sophism, can break the force or impair the perspicuity of this language. It proclaimed slavery to be a transgression of the laws of nature and of nature's God. These undying truths took strong hold upon the public mind of this nation, and of civilized man. They strike at the existence of property in man. Wherever these truths are acknowledged, slavery itself cannot exist.

Eleven years after these doctrines were recognised as the basis of American liberty and government, the present Constitution was adopted. The framers of that instrument had passed through a seven years' war, had encountered danger and toil, and great suffering, to establish upon a permanent basis the doctrines they had proclaimed in 1776. We have now reached an important period of our history, as regards this doctrine of *property in man.*

Mr. Madison, in his Papers, informs us, that on

"Wednesday, August 22, the Convention proceeded to consider the report of the Committee of Detail, in relation to duties on exports, a capitation tax, and a navigation act. The fourth section reported was as follows:

"'No tax or duty shall be laid by the Legislature on articles exported from any State nor on the migration nor importation of such persons as the several States shall think proper to admit; nor shall such migration nor importation be prohibited.'

"Mr. Gerry thought we had nothing to do with the conduct of the States as to slavery, *but we ought to be careful not to give any sanction.*"

Sir, will members from Massachusetts, the successors of Gerry, here to-day, maintain the doctrine which he laid down? Will they refuse all sanction of slavery, by refusing to legislate in its favor? Will they discard the proposition before us, as an indignity to the representatives of freemen? I trust they will. Mr. Madison informs us that "Mr. Sherman (of Connecticut) was opposed to any tax on slaves, as making the matter worse, *because it implied they were property.*"

Sir, Mr. Sherman, that patriot of distinguished ability, of the most unsullied purity, of the highest devotion to our country, would do no act which would sanction slavery, or imply that slaves were property. Since that day, more than sixty years have elapsed. Sherman has long since been gathered to his fathers. His precepts and examples are left on record for our instruction. Light and knowledge have progressed, mankind are advancing in refinement; yet, sir, an honorable member of this House from Connecticut, a successor of her favorite and distinguished Sherman, the present chairman of an important committee of this body, one who has long served here, and who is about to be transferred to the other end of the Capitol, silently unites in reporting to this body a bill to tax his constituents and the people of the North to pay for the body of a fellow-man as property. Sir, when that gentleman gets into the Senate, he and I shall be separated from each other. I shall be unable to follow him there, but I would now remind him of the example of his illustrious predecessor, and I would ask him if he intends to oppose to-day the doctrine of Sherman in 1787?

I cannot withhold the expression of my regret that any Northern member, particularly a Northern Whig of experience, should have tacitly acquiesced in presenting to us a proposition so offensive to every sentiment of freedom.

I appeal to the members from Connecticut to come forward to-day in support of the doctrine which Sherman proclaimed at the adoption of the Constitution. Will they acknowledge, in direct terms, by voting for this bill, that slaves are property under the Federal Constitution? Sherman would do no act that could imply such an acknowledgment. But let us trace the proceedings of the Convention a little further.

The discussion, it will be observed, turned upon the peculiar phraseology of the second part of the report, which, in classifying slaves as merchandise, seemed to imply that they were *property.* No one expressed a desire that such an idea should be imbodied in the Constitution; on the contrary, there was a manifest desire, on the part of the members of the Convention, to shape the phraseology as to exclude the construction given to it by Mr. Sherman. Mr. Madison, it seems, agreed with that gentleman. He thus reports himself:

"Mr. MADISON *thought it wrong to admit in the Constitution the idea that there could be property in man.*

"Colonel MASON, (in answer to Mr. GOUVERNEUR MORRIS.) The provision, as it now stands, *was necessary for the case of convicts,* in order to prevent the introduction of them.

"Still, the Convention was not satisfied, and it was finally agreed, *nem. con.,* to have the clause read:

"'But a tax or duty may be imposed on such importation, not exceeding ten dollars *for each person.*'

"And then the second part, as amended, was agreed to."

Thus, sir, the Convention that framed the Constitution expressed their denial that slaves were property. They have left no doubt on that point; they would use no language which could leave an implication of the doctrine now contended for by Southern gentlemen. It was discarded by them, but is now urged upon us. "*Mr. Madison thought it wrong to admit in the Constitution the idea that there could be property in men.*"

Sir, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. Woodward] asked, with great emphasis, "if any member of that Convention was so *stupid* as to doubt the propriety of holding property in men?" I answer, JAMES MADISON, the father of the Constitution, a Southern man, and afterwards President of the United States, has left on record his denial of that doctrine. I stand here now the advocate of the principle maintained in 1776—maintained by the entire Convention that framed the Constitution in 1787, including the illustrious Madison, and Sherman, and Gerry. Where are the representatives of Virginia to-day? Where the successors of Washington, of Jefferson, of Henry, and of Madison? Sir, the representatives of that "Old Dominion," the mother of statesmen and of States, now stand here as the advocates of oppression, degradation, and abject slavery. They, sir, denying the doctrines of the Constitution—the doctrines of Washington and his compatriots—insist, that one portion of mankind may own the other as *property.* Ah! sir, Virginia has fallen; "the fine gold has become dim." Her sons no longer lead the hosts of freedom; they have become hostile to the sentiments of their fathers; her people breed men, like oxen, for the shambles; drive women to market, and traffic in babes and children; moral darkness broods over her, and physical desolation reigns throughout her dominion.

Sir, these arguments can have little effect upon Southern men. They cannot and will not take any definite position on this subject. *To-day,* they will insist that slaves are not persons, but property. *To-morrow,* should a different question come before us, they will insist that slaves are *not* property, but *persons.* I have for ten years been striving to find out what definite principles Southern men hold on this subject, but I find that they refuse to adhere to any principle whatever. They are sometimes one way and sometimes the other. "Everything by turns, and nothing long," as the saying is. And now, sir, as an illustration of what I have stated, I venture to proclaim that not a member south of Mason and Dixon's line dare rise in his place and say that he adopts the doctrine, either that slaves are persons or that they are property. If such a member be present, I challenge him to rise in his place and say which side of this question he will espouse and adhere to; and I now offer for that purpose to yield the floor. [Mr. Giddings paused.]

Mr. WOODWARD, of South Carolina, rose and stated, in substance, that slaves were regarded as both persons *and* property.

Mr. GIDDINGS. Yes, they are a sort of amphibious animal—neither one nor the other, but composed of both. They are partly *persons* and partly *things;* part human and part inanimate. Well, sir, this I call "*sitting on the fence.*" I was aware that gentlemen could not be provoked to take any fixed position in regard to slavery. The truth is, slavery itself is an anomaly. It is opposed to all moral principle, as well as to natural rights, and can be reconciled to no rule of propriety. But to return to the Constitution. In every instance in which reference to slaves is made in the Constitution, they are termed *persons.* Thus, in fixing the ratio of representation, it provides that "the number shall be ascertained by adding to the whole number of free persons, including those bound to service for a term of years, and excluding Indians not taxed, three-fifths of all *other persons.*" It is clear that the framers not only regarded slaves as persons, but they were spoken of as *other* persons, thus placing them upon the same general basis as freemen. In the ninth section of the first article, the Constitution provides, that "the migration or importation of such *persons* as any of the States shall think proper to admit, shall not be prohibited until the year 1808," &c. Here, again, the language is carefully used to distinguish slaves from property. Again, in the second section of the third article, the Constitution provides: "No *person* held to service or labor in one State, under the laws thereof, and escaping into another, shall, by any law or regulation thereof, be discharged from such service or labor." Thus, in every instance in which the Constitution refers to slaves, they are designated as *persons,* contradistinguishing them from property. We are not only informed that the framers regarded it as wrong to admit in the Constitution "that there could be property in man," but they carefully employed such language, in framing that instrument, as to preclude such a presumption. So clear have they left this subject, that no man who examines it can have doubts. Nor is the subject left at this point. The construction of the Constitution belongs to the judicial branch of the Government.

In the case of Groves *vs.* Slaughter and others, (15 Peters's Reports, 449,) this question came distinctly before the Supreme Court of the United States. The constitution of Mississippi had prohibited the introduction of slaves into that State after a certain day. Slaves were taken there and sold on a credit, after the time allowed by the constitution of that State. Suit was commenced on the notes given in consideration of the slaves. The defence set up, that the contract was illegal and void under the constitution of that State, which prohibited the sale therein of slaves from without the State. The reply to this was, that slaves were *property,* and therefore the State of Mississippi had no power to prohibit their introduction into the State, as the power to regulate commerce between the States belonged only to Congress. In deciding the law, Judge McLean said:

"By the laws of certain States, slaves are treated as property; and the constitution of Mississippi prohibits their being brought into that State by citizens of other States for sale or as merchandise. Merchandise is a comprehensive term, and may include every article of traffic, whether foreign or domestic, which is properly embraced by a commercial regulation. But if slaves are considered in some of the States as merchandise, that cannot divest them of the leading and controlling quality of persons, by which they are designated in the Constitution. The character of property is given them by the local law. This law is respected, and all rights under it are protected by the Federal authorities; but the Constitution acts upon slaves as persons, and not as property."

If slaves be property, slave markets may be opened in Boston, and Massachusetts will have no power to prohibit these revolting scenes which are witnessed in this city. If the doctrine contended for by Southern men be correct, no State can exclude slave markets from its territory, or consecrate its soil to freedom. It well becomes Southern gentlemen to examine this subject before they base themselves upon the principle that slaves are property. Let that be established, and Congress will have power to prohibit the internal slave trade at its pleasure. We may then take slaves from their masters, as we do other property.

Gentlemen from the slave States, being accustomed to regard slaves as property, under their State laws, draw no distinction between the laws of the slave States and those of the Federal Government. Persons educated in the slave States, coming into the office of President, or into either of the Executive Departments, or into either House of Congress, are likely to bring with them the views imbibed in such States. Thus we find that in some instances the President of the United States and other officers of the Government have, at times, without examination, regarded slaves as property; and, in some instances, have paid the public funds for such slaves, not only without authority of law, but in opposition to the spirit and letter of the Federal Compact. The same officers, after having their attention called particularly to the subject, have seen their error, changed their practice, and refused to regard slaves as property. So, also, in some of our treaties, slaves are referred to in connection with other property. Such language is used in the treaty of Ghent, to which I called the attention of this committee in the early part of my remarks. But in these cases the language was employed without reference to the relation which slavery holds to the Federal Constitution, as contradistinguished from the character it possesses under the government of the States in which it exists.

But if we examine the subject a little more closely, we shall find that slaves are not regarded merely as property in any part of the country. In every State of the Union they are punishable for crimes under the State laws. Such is not the case with any species of property. Murder may be committed upon slaves in any State, and the murderer hanged therefor. But no such punishment applies to the killing of any other species of property. Slaves in such States are, however, for certain purposes, under their laws, regarded as a "*peculiar kind of property.*" But the laws of those States are *local,* and have no bearing upon the relations which the Federal Government holds to the institution. Slavery is the creature of municipal law, and can extend no further than such municipal enactment has force. It is, therefore, strictly confined to the jurisdiction creating it. So strictly is this rule of law observed by courts of justice, that if a slave escape from his master on to free soil, but for a moment, he becomes free forever. Thus, in the case of Forbes *vs.* Cochran *et al.,* (vide 2 Barnwell & Cresswell, 448,) Bayley, justice, remarked, "Slavery is a local law, and therefore, if a man wish to preserve his slaves, let him attach them to him by affection, or make fast the bars of their prison, or rivet well their chains; for the instant they get beyond the limits where slavery is recognised by the local laws, they have broken their chains, they have escaped from prison, they are free." The same principles were decided in the case of Sommersett, (see vol. 20, State Trials,) and are recognised by the courts of the United States, and by those of nearly all of the several States of this Union. *Property* may be taken by the owner from one State to another, or from one nation to another; but if a man voluntarily take his slave or send him to a free State, the moment he enters such State, he becomes a freeman. From that moment the master's power over him ceases, and he can no more be enslaved. The property in such case is instantaneously transformed into a *person.* But to examine this question a little further. Suppose the slaves of South Carolina, or of all the slave States, should rise in the plenitude of their power, assert their own rights, and enslave the whites, they would then become the *owners,* and their present masters would be transformed into property, according to this slaveholding logic. But I find I have no time to pursue this part of the subject further.

The gentleman from Maryland [Mr. Chapman] has cited a case where the twenty-eighth Congress passed a law directing payment to be made to Depeyster and another for a slave lost in the Florida war. This case is cited as a precedent to show that we have recognised slaves as property. I myself advocate the observance of precedents as strongly as any member of this House. I would deal out equal justice to all who apply for it. It is, therefore, proper that we should look to the former practice of this body in relation to the question.

After the close of the late war with England, in the year 1816, a law was passed allowing compensation to the owners of property lost or destroyed in the public service during the existence of hostilities. Pending the bill, an amendment was offered, providing for the payment of slaves lost in the public service. After discussion, the amendment was rejected in Committee of the Whole, only thirty rising in its favor. Yes, sir; at that time, only thirty members of this House regarded slaves as property.

Many petitions were subsequently presented, calling on Congress to pay for slaves killed in the public service, but no committee could be found who would report in favor of such a claim. In 1828-'29, the case of D'Auterive came before the Committee of Claims. The petitioner owned a slave, a horse, and a cart. On the day of the battle at New Orleans, they were pressed into the public service. The slave and horse were killed, and the cart destroyed, by the cannon-shot of the enemy. The owner then applied to Congress for compensation. The committee reported in favor of paying for the horse and cart, but against paying for the slave. When the bill came up in the House, an amendment was offered, giving compensation for the slave. The subject was debated for weeks. Those who opposed the amendment, based their objection upon the distinct principle that slaves were not property. And the bill was finally laid upon the table by a large majority.

At a more recent period, in 1832, Francis Larche, of New Orleans, presented a claim precisely similar to that just quoted, and it was referred to the Committee of Claims. The committee, in reporting upon the case, say they "had caused examination to be made at the Treasury Department, to see if slaves who had been killed in public service during the Revolutionary War had been paid for; and they learned that no such instance could be found." They also cite many cases in which compensation had been refused. These cases were of the character to obtain the most favorable consideration; but no committee could in that day be found willing to admit the moral and constitutional absurdity, that under our Federal compact slaves could be regarded as property. Yet, sir, they had not the advantages which we possess. "The Madison Papers," setting forth the views of those who framed the Constitution, were not then published; nor had the subject at that time been adjudicated in the Supreme Court. I wish the ear of every member of this body, when I assure them and the country that, from 1789 down to 1842, the committees of this body uniformly rejected all claims for slaves lost in the public service, regarding them as *persons,* and not as property.

In the 27th Congress, the claim of James Watson for slaves was committed to the Committee of Claims, of which I was myself an humble member. The friends of the claim, by some means, learned that that committee had always reported against the payment for slaves. They therefore obtained the transfer of that case to the Committee on Indian Affairs, who reported a bill to pay for the slaves claimed by Watson. That report, made six years since, was the first in favor of paying for slaves as property, so far as my knowledge extends, ever made to this body, under our present Constitution, or prior to its adoption. During that Congress, one other of the like character was made by the Committee on Territories. The bill last mentioned was rejected, on a call of the yeas and nays, after full discussion, only thirty-six votes being given in its favor. No final vote was ever taken on any other case of the kind, except the one referred to by the gentleman from Maryland, [Mr. Chapman,] which passed the 28th Congress. I was myself aware of the nature of that bill, and so was the late venerable member from Massachusetts, [Mr. Adams,] now deceased. We both intended to have made known to the House its character; but I was called away on one of those days when private bills were under consideration, and Mr. Adams's attention was diverted from it by some means, and the bill passed the House *sub silentio,* no one objecting to it; and I presume not a member of this body present, who understood both the character of the bill and the practice of the House on such claims, was conscious of its passage. If such members were here, they suffered it to pass without calling the attention of the House to it. Being, as it were, thus smuggled through this body, it can have no force as a precedent. The whole practice of Congress, when acting understandingly, from the adoption of the Constitution to this day, has been a denial of the doctrine that slaves are property under our Federal Constitution. The decisions of our courts are to the same effect. The Constitution itself, in every instance in which it refers to them, denominates them *persons,* and not property. The Declaration of Independence declares them to have been created *equal with ourselves.* The sentiment of the civilized world recognises them as *men,* as *brethren.* Yet we are called on to disregard all these considerations, and to enter upon an inquiry of the title by which one man holds another as property, and to determine the value of chattelized humanity. Northern members now see the respectful petitions of tens of thousands of their own constituents, praying to be released from the support of slavery, disregarded and treated with silent contempt. They are sent to our committees; there they remain forever. From that bourne "no traveller returns." The voice of humanity is there silenced; and those petitions, at the bidding of the slave power, sleep the sleep of death. No effort of ours, no artifice of legislation which we can exert, can get the subject before this House. No exhibition of the crimes, the appalling guilt of the slave trade carried on in this city before our eyes and before the nation, can provoke those committees to permit this body to pass judgment either for or against the prayers of hundreds of thousands of Northern lovers of freedom; but a single slaveholder sends his petition here, praying us to involve our people in the burden of slavery in Maryland; to take the funds of Northern philanthropists to pay for human flesh; and your committee—even Northern men on those committees—unite in favor of the measure; and this whole body is at once engaged upon a bill to involve our people still more in the expense and in the crime of supporting that institution, not merely in this District, but in Maryland. Will Northern Whigs, will Northern Democrats, meekly bow to such dictation? Will we continue to do the bidding of Southern masters, and, in our official character, enter upon this proposed slave trade? No; self-respect forbids it. Northern sentiment forbids it. The Constitution, our oath of office, the age in which we live, the opinions of civilized men, the laws of nature, and the voice of God, forbid that we shall prostitute the dignity of our station thus to uphold oppression and encourage crime.

ALMANAC FOR 1848.

THE LIBERTY ALMANAC FOR 1848, compiled by the Rev. Joshua Leavitt, and published by the American and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, contains, in addition to the usual calculations, astronomical tables, &c., a great variety of important facts and statistics, bearing directly upon the subject of slavery, not to be found in any other publication, and prepared with special reference to the present position of the question in this country. In the confident expectation of a large demand, the work has been handsomely stereotyped, and printed on good paper; and, to secure its extensive circulation, the wholesale price has been fixed at the following reduced rates: 250 copies, or upwards, at $30 per thousand; 100 or 200 copies, at $3.50 per hundred; 50 copies for $2; 25 copies for $1.

All orders must be accompanied by the cash, and designate *the mode of conveyance* by which they are to be forwarded. Post office stamps may be sent for fractions of a dollar.

The friends of universal emancipation are earnestly called upon to aid in giving this valuable Anti-Slavery document a circulation commensurate with its merits, and its peculiar adaptation to the present state of things in this country.

For sale, wholesale and retail, at the Office and Depository of the American and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, No. 61 John street, New York, by

WILLIAM HARNED, Publishing Agent.

☞ Anti-Slavery papers will please copy. Oct. 14.

LARD OIL.

IMPROVED LARD OIL.—Lard Oil of the finest quality, equal to sperm for combustion, also for machinery and woollens, being manufactured without acids, can always be purchased and shipped in strong barrels, prepared expressly to prevent leakage. Orders received and executed for the Lake, Atlantic, and Southern cities, also for the West Indies and Canadas. Apply to

THOMAS EMERY, Lard Oil Manufacturer,
Jan. 20. 33 Water street, near Walnut, Cincinnati, O.

LAW OFFICE, CINCINNATI.

BIRNEY & SHIELDS, Attorneys at Law, corner of Main and Court streets, Cincinnati.

JAMES BIRNEY, Notary Public and Commissioner to take acknowledgments of deeds and depositions for the States of Maine, Vermont, Connecticut, Michigan, New Hampshire, Missouri, Illinois, Tennessee, New York, and Arkansas.
Jan. 6.—tf

DEBATE IN THE SENATE ON THE OREGON BILL.

MR. HALE'S SPEECH.

One of the most interesting and important debates of this session arose last week on the Oregon bill. The twelfth section of this bill recognises the law made by the Provisional Government, excluding slavery from the Territory, and extends to Oregon the ordinance of 1787. It was on a motion to strike out this section that the debate occurred.

From Houston's Reports.

[Mr. FOOTE made some remarks, in his characteristic style, assailing the Senator from New Hampshire, and expressing alarm on account of the dangerous consequences which the agitation of this subject was likely to produce in the coming election.]

Mr. HALE. It seems to me there is some inconsistency in the views of some gentlemen of the Senate. I am accused of embarrassing this subject by the introduction of a proposition, which seems especially to alarm the Senator from Mississippi, who regards it as calculated to affect the Presidential election. Now, to quiet the fears of the honorable gentleman, I will tell him, in all honesty, that, so far as I am advised, my friends do not anticipate running a ticket in that election in the State of Mississippi.

Mr. FOOTE. I will tell the Senator that I should not be apprehensive of the result of running any such ticket in the neighborhood where I reside. Any other ticket than that of Cass and Butler I have not thought of; and, if I had, it would be with such scorn as would not allow me to feel the least apprehension.

Mr. HALE. Well, the candidates will feel "very bad" at this announcement, no doubt! But I rose for the purpose of saying that this is no movement of mine. I have thrown in no firebrands. On the contrary, I have been trying to remove them. Complaints are made that a pestiferous question has been introduced; that a firebrand has been thrown into the Senate—a question introduced that is likely to produce agitation. I can only say that it has been my purpose to remove any such cause of agitation. For one, sir, I want the country to understand what this proposition is. I have always done ample justice to the people of the South. I have said to my friends at the North, when you hear these men you know them, you can see them hard. They are not like that contemptible animal that I have not seen described in any history of animated nature I have read, a "Northern man with Southern principles." They are bold and open. They tell you what they want, and how they want it. When you deal with such men, you can understand them. Stripped of its verbiage, then, the proposition before us is simply this: that slavery is one of the natural and inherent rights of property which belong to the people of the South, over which this Government or the Government of the Territory has no control. I hope that I have now stated correctly the extent of this proposition. If it goes any farther, I hope it will be so announced. The people of the North have been desirous to get down to low-water mark, just as far as the requisitions of this institution required them to go; but, after they had bowed so low that their back was almost broken, they have been told that there was a still lower point to which it was necessary that they should go. It has now, however, come to this—that a claim is set up to an absolute, inherent, indefeasible right, with which neither Congress nor the people of a Territory have any right to meddle. Well, now, is it possible that anybody acquainted with the legislation of this country from its foundation, can listen patiently to such pretensions? Was the ordinance of '87 an insult to the South? If so, why has it not been found out before? Why have they permitted that standing insult to remain upon the legislation of the country? How has it happened that, with their peculiar sensitiveness to insult—their chivalric sense of honor—their keen perceptions——

Mr. BAGBY. I did not say that the action of this Government, in any respect, upon any subject, was an insult. I asked this question: If, when gentlemen on the other side admitted it was not necessary to interpose this obstacle to the admission of slavery into that Territory, it was not an insult to the South to propose it?

Mr. HALE. I did not refer to the gentleman from Alabama, but to a remark of the honorable Senator from South Carolina, who said, if I did not misunderstand him, that the proposition was insulting to one-half of the States of this Union—a sentiment in which I believe the Senator from Mississippi concurred.

Mr. FOOTE. It seems to me, that when the gentleman from New Hampshire renews his amendment, his remarks may be in place; but I doubt their propriety now. He certainly is not justified in making them on the ground that he is responding to me.

Mr. HALE. If the honorable gentleman says he did not say anything, I certainly do not mean to say anything to him. But I was proceeding to inquire how it happened that those very sensitive gentlemen, with their keenness of perception and quickness of resentment, had not before this time found out the insult under which they have been grieving for more than half a century? Why, sir, did they not make the discovery when the bill for the admission of Iowa as a Territory was before this body? That bill contained, in express terms, the very provisions contained in the 12th section of the bill now before us, which is now deemed so insulting, and denounced as a firebrand. I find that the question on the motion to lay that bill upon the table was taken by yeas and nays, and decided in the negative by a large majority, many Southern members voting against it.

Again I ask, why did not the gentleman then discover this insult to the South? With all respect to these gentlemen, I must say that I can have very little sympathy with that exquisitely nice sense of honor which cannot find out an insult until it becomes to be sixty years old! The honorable Senator from Alabama said, that by no possibility could slavery be introduced into this Territory, and that therefore the insult was the more mortal. Pray, sir, who then is fighting for an abstraction? The amendment has been withdrawn. The bill is before us just as it was reported by the Committee on the Territories; and yet these very gentlemen, so sensitive to insult, wish to introduce an amendment giving them liberty to carry slaves into territory where they say they never want to carry them, and never can carry them. Who, then, now brings in an abstraction? Who thrusts a pestiferous question upon us? Who seeks to mar the harmony of the "party?" Who desires now to disturb the prospects of the most eminent and illustrious ticket that is to sweep the country, and annihilate all opposition? Does the disturbance come from firebrand Abolitionists? Not at all, sir. It comes from this very sensitive quarter of the Union so prone to cast reproaches against everybody who introduces this subject of abolition, as they are pleased to call it, and who, the moment it is withdrawn, bring it in themselves!

I know that I stand here under peculiar circumstances; but I can appeal to gentlemen on the other side of the Senate in proof of the statement, that I was applied to by those for whose opinions I have deep regard, to withdraw the amendment, in order that they might proceed with the bill. At their request, I did withdraw the amendment, in order that their feelings of humanity that had been appealed to so eloquently by the honorable Senator from Missouri, to the profound agitation of the sympathies which stir the benevolent heart of my friend from Mississippi, might be gratified. I do not desire to be obstinate, or to embarrass or to impede the action of the Senate. I am not at all desirous of claiming a right to any of the hard names which have been flying so thickly around me, and therefore, at the risk of offending those whose judgments I regard as much as those of any around me, and who have stood by me when their sympathies were worth something, and their votes worth more, I consented to withdraw this pestiferous amendment, this firebrand, in order to ascertain if I could not produce a little harmonious action here. But what has been the result? Something more pestiferous still is introduced; and when I reminded the honorable Senator from Alabama that I had withdrawn it, he says that no doubt I intend to introduce it again.

Mr. BUTLER. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question? I understand that the honorable gentleman has withdrawn his amendment for the present only, with leave to introduce it again after the amendment of the gentleman from Florida had been disposed of; so that he let his firebrand burn out, when he saw another one likely to be used, with the intention of restoring his own afterwards.

Mr. HALE. The Senator makes a statement; when he puts his question, I will endeavor to answer it.

Mr. BUTLER. I ask the gentleman whether he did not withdraw his amendment with a distinct notice that he would introduce it again?

Mr. HALE. I will answer the Senator. I asked the Presiding Officer of the Senate, if I withdrew the amendment this time, and suffered the question to be taken on the amendment of the Senator from Florida, then pending, whether it would not be in order to introduce the amendment again; to which he replied in the affirmative. I then withdrew the amendment, giving notice that I reserved to myself the right to renew it if I thought proper. I can have no hesitation in stating what my intention was. It was this: if the bill was allowed to remain as it was, I did not intend to renew my amendment; but, if other doctors went to dose it, I meant to try my medicine again. I believe the Senator now understands me.

Permit me to say, that I differ entirely from the gentlemen on the other side, who have laid down the proposition, that property in slaves stands upon the same foundation as other property mentioned in the Constitution. If I had time and opportunity, I might present to the Senator ample authority for the distinction which I thus announce. I might bring judicial decisions of the highest authority, from almost every one of the Southern States, to establish the proposition. Slave property is the mere creation of local, municipal law; and when, by consent of its owner, it is removed from the territorial limits of that municipal law, it ceases to be property; the thing then merges into a man; and, although he may afterwards return to the territory in which the character of property was affixed to him, he cannot be recaptured and made a slave. I believe that I have one of these decisions before me, and I may refer to it.

Davis *vs.* Jaquin, 5 Harris & Johnson, 107. *Stewart vs. Oakes, Note,* Maryland Court of Appeals, 1813, 3d volume U. S. Digest, p. 172, sec. 175.

By the law passed December 17, 1792, chap. 103, sec. 2, "slaves which shall hereafter be brought into this Commonwealth, and kept therein one whole year together, or so long at different times as shall amount to one year, shall be free."

The facts are: This petitioner was the slave of the defendant, who is a citizen of Maryland, and resided therein prior to 10th of January, 1783 and has resided there ever since. That he owns a stone quarry in the State of Virginia, where he has been in the habit of taking the petitioner for a number of years past, for the purpose of working in the quarry, making the time of the petitioner's being in Virginia, in the whole, upwards of one year. The defendant never resided in Virginia, except for the purpose of quarrying stones as aforesaid, and always returned to this State, (where his family constantly remained) as soon as he got a sufficient number of stones to supply his manufactory at Baltimore. The petitioner never applied to any court of record, or competent tribunal, in Virginia, for the purpose of obtaining his freedom under the laws of that State. The petitioner was always brought back to this State by the defendant without being compelled thereto by any force or violence. The several times in which the petitioner remained in Virginia were subsequent to the passage of the above-mentioned law of Virginia.

Under this state of facts the Court of *Oyer and Terminer* discharged the prisoner from slavery, and the Court of Appeals confirmed the judgment.

Take that single case, and you have a most forcible illustration of the difference that exists between property in men and property in things.

Would it be for a moment contended, that the title of the owner of a horse in Virginia, would be extinguished if the horse were twelve months out of the State? It is then a decided principle, that this right, instead of being a natural, indefeasible right, is a qualified one, dependent upon the local municipal legislation of the Government that undertakes to establish it. Not long ago, it was decided in England by Lord Mansfield, that, in "Sommersett's" case, the common law and civil law were both against the right or wrong, whichever you may please to call it; and, wherever it exists, I venture to say, I may challenge its advocates the world over to find a decision of any respectability in which it will not be held, that the right, wherever it exists, exists solely by virtue of the local legislation establishing it; and that, when the individual goes beyond the limits of that legislation, he becomes free—that right in this country being qualified by the provision of the Constitution, requiring States to surrender fugitive slaves.

Without going any further south, I might stand here till the shades of evening should fall upon us, detailing to the Senate, in language which I might poorly attempt to imitate, the desolating and demoralizing influence of this institution upon every interest of a State. I might go to Virginia, and, selecting my authorities from among the most eminent statesmen that have adorned this country, both of the living and the dead, bring to you volumes of testimony as to the desolating effects and influences of this institution; compared with which, the wildest fanaticism, against which you rail, would be stale and insipid. But I forbear. Let me, however, advert to one fact which has impressed itself upon my memory with peculiar force. I have seen it in the other House. I have listened to it and read it. When gentlemen of the free States have descanted on the evils of slavery, and the iniquity of this Government lending itself to its further extension and perpetuation, gentlemen from the slaveholding States have immediately retorted and said, "You have fastened it upon us—it was the avarice of New England merchants engaging in this trade, and the avarice of the mother country, which fastened this institution upon us against our consent; and now, whilst you are enjoying the fruits of this traffic in the wealth which by it you have amassed, why reproach us with it?" Now, let me in all candor and kindness ask these gentlemen if there is justice in their reproach, why shall we subject ourselves and our posterity to the same reproach, from the inhabitants of the territory over which we are about to organize a Government? Why should we incur the reproaches of those unborn millions who are hereafter to inhabit these regions? Why should we, by our conduct, now justify them in saying to our descendants, "Why was it that, when you knew the enormity of this evil, when you were loading with reproaches the cupidity of Eastern merchants engaged in this loathsome traffic, when all the calamities which this institution visits upon every people amongst whom it exists were visibly before you—why was it that you determined that these hills and valleys should be baptized in the guilt of its blood and tears?" Will we not, sir, justly earn these bitter reproaches, if, by our action now we extend to this region that which all admit to be an evil—and that, too, when the people who now inhabit it, themselves profiting by our sad experience, and warned by our mournful example, have in the birthday of their history declared that they desire to put far from them the accursed thing? The honorable Senator from Mississippi, however, has revealed a secret which a great many men less honest and impulsive than himself would have studiously concealed. It is not that justice, and liberty, and humanity, and truth, stand in the way; but, Oh! it is the danger of splitting the "Party" at the next Presidential election.

[Mr. FOOTE denied that the danger to the "ticket" was the sole motive which operated on his mind. He then spoke of Mr. Hale in the most unmeasured terms of abuse—alluded to his presence at the "Liberty Breakfast," &c.]

Mr. HALE. I do not know but that the remarks of the Senator do require some notice at my hands. This is not the first occasion on which remarks of a somewhat similar character have been made by the honorable Senator from Mississippi. I believe that I may be permitted to say that I can appeal to every gentleman in the Senate, on both sides of the Chamber, that, ever since I have been a member of the body, I have never on any occasion—in the Senate or out of it—so far forgotten myself as to be wanting in that respect, that courtesy and that kindness, which ought to characterize the intercourse of gentlemen and Christians. I believe that, in the hearing of the Senate, I can appeal to every man to bear me witness, that on no occasion, even when standing alone, my views misrepresented, my principles denounced, and my person threatened, have I so far forgotten myself as not to remember what was due to the proprieties of this Chamber, and to every individual with whom I come in contact. I can assure the honorable Senator from Mississippi, and I think he cannot deny it, that attacks and allusions, such as he has made, whatever their effect—if they had any effect—may have been upon others, they reached not me. And now I leave the honorable Senator. I leave him secure in the enjoyment of all the glory, all the reputation, and all the self-satisfaction, which he may gain, here or elsewhere, now or forever, by any such course as that which he has thought proper to pursue.

Mr. FOOTE. Do I understand the Senator as saying that I demeaned myself?

Mr. HALE. Very far from it!

I am exceedingly unwilling to make myself the subject of remark before this body. I did not come here for that purpose. But it has been forced upon me, and I must say a word in vindication. The Senator is entirely mistaken when he represents me as denouncing the Union.

Mr. FOOTE. Did not the Senator say that he would urge his amendment, even if its adoption should lead to the dissolution of the Union?

Mr. HALE. No such thing! I said that on this question we must take a course which commends itself to us as right—that, having found where the right was, we must abide by it, regardless of consequences—and that if the result should be that which was talked of so much—the dissolution of the Union—if it shall be found that this glorious Union of ours, endeared as it was to us by so many cherished associations, had no other principle of cement but the blood of slavery, let it sunder! *That is just exactly what I said.* Who, then, speaks of reproach upon the Constitution? Who rakes up the ashes of the illustrious dead, and pours contempt upon the living, but the man who would come forward and declare that the cement of this Union is slavery?

Mr. FOOTE (in his seat.) Nobody says it!

Mr. HALE. Well, then I have not said that the Union ought to be dissolved. (A laugh.) The honorable Senator has undertaken to administer to me a great deal of reproof, and advice, and caution, and perhaps he will think I speak in irony when I say—I thank him—I thank him! I am not so old or so obstinate that I am not willing to be taught. I surely evince my docility when I say that I am willing to learn Senatorial manners from the gentleman from Mississippi; but permit me to say, in all kindness—and I mean no unkindness to anybody—I do think that, when the Senator from Mississippi undertakes to give advice, and talk about "windy and gusty harangues" and "antics," and so forth, he mistakes his calling! I think he has need to repeat this line of the poet—

"O! wad some power the giftie gie us,
To see oursels as others see us!"

I think that if he occasionally reflected on that line, he would not be found giving me any lectures again.

Once for all I desire to say, that we have strong convictions upon this subject. We believe that slavery is an evil—a moral, political, social evil. In the expression of that belief we do not go beyond the declaration of many distinguished citizens of the Southern States. I believe that the legislation of this country, from the adoption of the Constitution to the present time, has been continually subservient to this institution; and, so far from believing as gentlemen on the other side have said, that they stand upon the defensive, I believe that this legislation has been constantly aggressive. I believe that we are now engaged in a war, costing us more than fifty millions annually, for the perpetuation of this institution. I think I can call witnesses from the other side of the Senate to prove, that at least one gentleman has furnished me with his deposition in perpetual remembrance of this fact. But I do not need it. The fact stands out so boldly in the history of the country, that neither the present age nor posterity can be in any doubt with regard to it.

I have trespassed longer than I intended upon the attention of the Senate. The subject is by no means a pleasant one to me; but, unpleasant as it is, so long as I have the honor of a seat upon this floor, I shall on every fitting occasion—of which I myself must be the judge—within the rule of the Senate, and that propriety and decorum which become a body of gentlemen, introduce anything that in my judgment falls within the range of legislation, be it "pestiferous" or not—let it endanger the success of any ticket—be it illustrious or ignoble; and when I offend against the proprieties of this place, or that decorum which should prevail amongst men, I am willing to submit to whatever rebuke the Senate in its wisdom may see proper to administer. But because this is an unpalatable, unwholesome, and pestiferous subject to the minds of some men, is there to be freedom of debate on every other subject, and for every other man but myself on this subject, and to me that freedom is to be denied? No, sir; and I only regret that there have not been others, abler and older men, to raise their voices before the Senate, speaking out what I know and what they know to be the deep convictions of their constituents on this subject. I regret that this great issue, upon which the destinies of the country are dependent, should by the force of circumstances, or the sense of propriety of those around me, be left in such feeble hands. But unequal as I am to the task, feeble as are my powers, overwhelming as are *the odds against me,* entertaining these convictions, I must press them upon the consideration of the American Senate and the American People. Permit me to say, in no spirit of intimidation or menace, that the People are a vast way ahead of any of those who talk here upon this floor on this subject. A deep feeling on this subject sways the hearts of the American People—a feeling which is gathering strength, and never can be repressed! In the Empire State, the heart of the young Democracy has been touched—they have arisen, with the strength of another Samson, and have snapped asunder like burning tow the withes with which they have been bound. And where is that other giant of the West, that stretches itself in the peaceful valley of the Ohio? A feeling is swelling in men's hearts there, the strength and importance of which are but little appreciated here. Perhaps the extent and depth of that growing tide of popular sentiment will not be fully developed until the last experiment be made on their endurance, in the nomination of him whose fame has been acquired in a war which they detest.

I leave this subject for the present. It certainly cannot be more unpleasant for the Senate to listen to me, than it is to me to be compelled to utter these truths here. I am sensible that these poor efforts of mine, repeated, as the honorable Senator from Mississippi has said, tautologically, over and over again, are irksome and wearisome. I would to God that some other man might rise up, not belonging to the ranks of a proscribed few—might rise up here to advocate these great truths! Would to Heaven that some other man might rise up and speak, so that the Senate and the nation should know that when he spoke his State and his party spoke, those truths which are so unwelcome, coming from a man whose party subjects him only to the scorn of Senators. If I am running the race of popularity, I have chosen a strange road to it. Let me assure gentlemen that there is no office within the gift of the Executive or the People that I solicit. Never shall I condescend to flatter popular prejudice or popular passion. I shall content myself with the enunciation of what I believe to be the truth upon such occasions as my own judgment may commend, willing to bide my time and await the consequences.

PRINTERS' MATERIALS.

TYPE FOUNDRY.—The subscribers have taken the Type Foundry, No. 59 Gold street, and will continue the business heretofore conducted by Robert Taylor. They will attend to all orders they may receive with punctuality and despatch. All the Type manufactured by them will be hand cast, and they will furnish all kinds of Printers' Materials of the best quality.

Mr. J. A. T. Overend is still employed in superintending the manufacturing department.

WHITING & TAYLOR,
Successors to Robert Taylor, corner of Gold and Ann streets, New York.
Charles Whiting.
Theodore Taylor.
Jan. 20.—tf